

Cult Histories and the Sources of Acts

When source criticism attempts to imagine the history of the literary predecessors of a given document, it must appeal to probabilities and propose the unverifiable. Therefore, it is no surprise that Jacques Dupont's careful analysis of the sources in Acts not only noted that no agreement existed about the sources of Acts but also refused to proffer a comprehensive thesis of its own⁽¹⁾. Dupont admitted that there is general agreement that literary sources of some kind underlie Acts but insisted that those sources are beyond recovery or identification. Luke has written a seamless narrative in which all sources have succumbed to his syntax and style; he has obliterated his sources and they are therefore unknowable. If Dupont is right then it would seem we are left without permission to say anything for a particular text in Acts about the possible sources. The tool of source criticism has been taken from us⁽²⁾.

This article does not attempt to propose a new theory about the sources of Acts by hunting for seams in the text or by detecting in scattered pericopes a singular point of view. We shall not begin then with an examination of the text. Instead, this article proposes

(1) J. DUPONT, *Les sources du Livre des Actes: État de la question* (Bruges 1960) 159.

(2) On the continuing discussion of sources in Acts see J. JERVELL, *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis 1972); W. W. GASQUE, "Did Luke Have Access to Traditions about the Apostles and the Early Churches?", *Journal of Evangelical Theological Study* 17 (1974) 45-48, and *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles* (Tübingen 1975); A. J. MATTILL, "The Value of Acts as a Source for the Study of Paul", *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (ed. C. H. Talbert) (Perspectives in Religious Studies 5; Edinburgh 1978) 76-98. E. ZELLER, *The Contents and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. J. Dare) (2 vols.; Edinburgh 1875-76) 302, anticipated this skepticism with attempting source criticism in Acts through detecting changes in syntax and style: "Similarly, little can be proved by the connection, or want of connection, of individual paragraphs with those preceding and following because... a fixed hand pervades the whole..." (Quoted in MATTILL, "Acts as a Source", 89).

that Luke operated as any respectable Greco-Roman historian would have operated⁽³⁾. If Luke is in any sense typical of the ancient historian then this implies a particular relationship with sources. This particularity extends into what the sources might have been and how they would have been gathered and treated.

I. The Sources of Acts

Ernst Haenchen's commentary on Acts illustrates modern hesitation to identify precise sources. Haenchen declares that arguments in support of an Antiochene source or a travel-journal are inconclusive⁽⁴⁾. But he does not conclude concomitantly that the author used no sources. In fact he argues the opposite.

When, years after Paul had run his course, Luke set about the task of describing the era of primitive Christianity, various possibilities of collecting the required material lay open to him. He could himself, for example, look up the most important Pauline communities — say Philippi, Corinth, Ephesus, Antioch. He might even visit Jerusalem. But it was also possible for him to ask other Christians travelling to

⁽³⁾ On the discussion of Luke as historian see C. H. TALBERT, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (SBLMS 20; Missoula 1974) 67-88; D. J. SNEEN, "An Exegesis of Luke 1:1-4 with Special Regard to Luke's Purpose as an Historian", *ExpTim* 83 (1971-72) 40-43; E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas als hellenistischen Schriftsteller. Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen 1972); I. H. MARSHALL, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Grand Rapids 1971); MATTILL, "Acts as a Source"; E. HAENCHEN, *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (trans. Noble et al.) (Oxford 1971) 90-112; C. K. BARRETT, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study* (London 1961).

⁽⁴⁾ HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 81, claims, contra Paul Feine, that stylistic criteria yield no evidence of sources. He considers wanting also the argument for an Antiochene source (*Acts*, 87, 369), which was advocated first by A. Harnack, and defended by R. BULTMANN, "Zur Frage nach den Quelle der Apostelgeschichte", *New Testament Essays* (ed. A. J. B. Higgins) (Manchester 1959) 68-80, and J. JEREMIAS, "Die antiochenische Quelle und die Datierung der ersten Missionsreise", *ZNW* 36 (1937) 213-220. Haenchen also does not accept as proven the existence of the travel-journal, which was advocated by M. DIBELIUS, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London 1956) and E. TROCMÉ, *Le Livre des Actes et l'histoire* (Paris 1957). Haenchen is not hereby rejecting sources altogether since he admits the possibility and even the probability that Luke had sources of some kind related to Antioch and from companions of Paul. He is rejecting the ability of the exegete to detect any direct literary evidence for these documents.

these places to glean for him whatever was still known of the old times (if he was preparing Acts about the year 75, twenty years would not yet have elapsed since Paul's death, and perhaps forty from the foundation of the community in Antioch). Lastly, he could have written to the congregations in question and asked them for information⁽⁵⁾.

Thus, Haenchen approaches the problem by imagining the method Luke might have used. And given this imagined procedure, Haenchen detects evidence of sources throughout Acts⁽⁶⁾. For instance, he suggests that Luke probably contacted Philippi or someone associated with Philippi for his narrative in Acts 16,11-40.

Luke probably received the information concerning Philippi — directly or indirectly — from an eyewitness of the Pauline mission... He may have received not only information about the founding of the community and the expulsion of the Apostle, but also stories which circulated about Paul in Philippi⁽⁷⁾.

Furthermore, Haenchen notes that 1 Thess 2,2 supports the account in Acts in that it mentions the great difficulties Paul encountered there⁽⁸⁾. Therefore, Haenchen is arguing not that Acts is historically reliable but that Luke received the basic content of his stories from churches and people associated with the events. For instance, the account in Acts 18,1-17 about Corinth is not necessarily true, but it may be how those events were remembered in Corinth.

Although Martin Hengel is considerably more sanguine about the historical reliability of Acts, he agrees substantially with Haenchen about Luke's method of collecting data⁽⁹⁾. He imagines Luke

⁽⁵⁾ HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 86.

⁽⁶⁾ See, for example, HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 87, 390-391, 402. His descriptions of these sources are quite imprecise. When trying to describe the source behind the stories of Paul in Corinth (Acts 18,1-17), he says only that Luke "must have drawn on some source or other" (537).

⁽⁷⁾ HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 503.

⁽⁸⁾ HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 504. Of course, Haenchen's argument here is not persuasive, because both Acts and the letters of Paul constantly depict Paul in trouble. It could be just a coincidence made likely by the frequency of the phenomenon in both corpora.

⁽⁹⁾ On Hengel's high evaluation of the credibility of Luke as an historian (he argues that Luke the physician is the actual author) see M. HENGEL, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (trans. John Bowden) (Philadelphia 1980) 1-68. Hengel also argues contrary to Haenchen that two written sources are identifiable: an Antiochene source and a collection of stories about Peter (65-66).

searching for old traditions, questioning those people who handed on the traditions, and evaluating critically his sources⁽¹⁰⁾.

This article maintains that Haenchen and Hengel are correct about Luke's method of collecting sources. Luke is to be imagined as inquiring in Corinth, Antioch, Ephesus, and elsewhere concerning their memories of their founding and their relationships with famous apostles. These memories, whether reliable or not, whether written or not, were then transposed and transformed into the Lukan narrative.

Furthermore, this thesis is more than a probable way to deal with the opacity of the narrative in Acts, for it has historical warrants. The method of collecting sources imagined here for Luke is exactly that method proposed by ancient historians for gathering data. And, as we shall see, there is corroborating evidence for deducing that Luke proceeded in this fashion.

II. Cult Histories

As was the literary custom, Flavius Philostratus at the beginning of his *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* details his method of collecting sources. The empress Julia had commanded Philostratus to rewrite and edit the dialogues of Damis, which Damis had composed during his wanderings with Apollonius. Philostratus extended this project by collecting as much reliable information as he could about Apollonius. Philostratus gives the formulaic claim to veracity and then describes his method.

And I have gathered my information partly from the many cities where he was loved, and partly from the temples whose long-neglected and decayed rites he restored, and partly from accounts left of him by others and partly from his own letters⁽¹¹⁾.

Whether the described method was actually carried out in this case is uncertain. It is difficult to determine if Philostratus actually visited the most important locations or wrote them or made it all up. Nevertheless, he claims that he did this, because this is how a good

⁽¹⁰⁾ HENGEL, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity*, 61-63.

⁽¹¹⁾ PHILOSTRATUS, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (trans. F. C. Conybeare) (LCL; Cambridge 1969) 1.2.

historian should claim to proceed. A historian, before he undertakes a narrative, is expected to have done a minimal amount of research. That minimal amount includes contacting the cities and cults involved.

The discussion in antiquity about the proper way to conduct history writing was quite animated⁽¹²⁾. There was certainly no absolute consensus, but there are identifiable patterns to how ancient historians operated and how they understood the requisite standards⁽¹³⁾. The discussion centered on the question of veracity and how different methods of compilation and criticism effected the credibility of the narrative. Admittedly there was no attempt in antiquity to argue that veracity alone was sufficient — pedagogy was always paramount. But this did not mean, except in rare instances, that veracity had no role⁽¹⁴⁾.

It was classical historiography that set the highest standards. Although Herodotus was never accepted in antiquity as the best model for accuracy, he did create some of the basic standards. Arnaldo Momigliano points out that, although much of what Herodotus proposed did not persuade his successors, his preference for the

⁽¹²⁾ See, for example, LUCIAN, *How to Write History*; CICERO, *De oratore* 2.13.55-58; DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS, *De imitatione* 3; QUINTILIAN, *Instit. Orat.* 10.1.73-75. See also the prefaces to any ancient historian wherein method is discussed.

⁽¹³⁾ See general introductions to ancient historiography: H. E. BARNES, *A History of Historical Writing* (New York 1963); S. USHER, *The Historians of Greece and Rome* (London 1969); J. B. BURY, *The Ancient Greek Historians* (New York 1958); K. VON FRITZ, *Die Griechische Geschichtsschreibung*, vol. 1 (Berlin 1967); M. L. W. LAISTNER, *The Greater Roman Historians* (Berkeley 1963); M. GRANT, *The Ancient Historians* (London 1970); A. MOMIGLIANO, *Studies in Historiography* (New York and Evanston 1966).

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cicero (*Brutus* 42) remarks somewhat ironically that "the privilege is conceded to rhetoricians to distort history in order to give more point to their narrative" (trans. G. L. Hendrickson; LCL [Cambridge, Mass. 1962]). And certainly the later Roman historians had an uneven regard for accuracy. Cato the elder, Sallust, and Livy seem to have more regard for style and political alignment than for the facts (GRANT, *The Ancient Historians*, 167-180, 195-242). Of course, the writers with the least regard for accuracy were the collectors of local chronicles for cities and temples. See E. GABBA, "True History and False History in classical Antiquity", *JRS* 71 (1981) 50-62; A. MOMIGLIANO, "Tradition and the Classical Historian", *Quinto Contributo Alla Storia Degli Studi Classici e del Mondo Antico*, vol. 1 (Storia e Letteratura 135; Rome 1975) 22-25.

accounts of living people over written documents did produce a similar preference among subsequent historians for eyewitnesses over written documents. Herodotus had the habit of distinguishing for the reader between what he had seen or heard personally and what he received from others who had. In fact, Herodotus is constantly reporting his sources, oral and written, and establishing their relative value⁽¹⁵⁾. Furthermore, Momigliano argues that it was actually the acceptance by Thucydides of Herodotus' preference for orality that determined its influence on subsequent historians. Thucydides insisted that "the historian had to have been present at the scene of action or to have used the reports of those who were present"⁽¹⁶⁾. Therefore, any historian who wanted to place himself in the tradition of Thucydides either had to do the same or claim to do so.

Polybius echoes this preference and details how a competent historian should proceed. In his description we can detect the powerful influence of this preference for oral sources over written ones. He claims that the only proper history is contemporary or near-contemporary, because the historian must always be able to consult the participants⁽¹⁷⁾. Therefore, when he was in Rome he constantly interviewed the envoys, hostages, and Roman soldiers who had participated in the events⁽¹⁸⁾. But careful research is not enough. For instance, he criticizes Timaeus because he wrote history from his study and did not participate in any of the events or in any similar events⁽¹⁹⁾. The ideal is to have been there. But if not, then certain precautions are appropriate. Michael Grant summarizes, "To Polybius, the elements in historical research are three. Political experience is one, and written documentation is another; and the third 'consists in inspection of various cities and places, rivers, lakes, and generally the particular features and distances on land and sea'"⁽²⁰⁾.

(15) A. MOMIGLIANO, "Historiography on Written Tradition and Historiography on Oral Tradition", *Studies in Historiography* (New York and Evanston 1966) 213.

(16) MOMIGLIANO, "Historiography on Written Tradition and Historiography on Oral Tradition", 214.

(17) POLYBIUS 12.4c.

(18) GRANT, *The Ancient Historians*, 160.

(19) POLYBIUS 12.4a, 4c, 7, 25. Cited by GRANT, *The Ancient Historians*, 140.

(20) GRANT, *The Ancient Historians*, 161; POLYBIUS 12.25e.

Therefore, travel is important. A historian ought to visit the sites and consult the participants.

Of course, this high standard is not maintained in most historians of the Hellenistic or Roman era. It collides with the desire to edify. There are prolonged discussions in Sallust and Livy over the conflict between accuracy and style⁽²¹⁾. It seems then that the extensive apology at the beginning of Diodorus Siculus is a typical attempt to address the complexities of historical methodology in the empire⁽²²⁾. Diodorus Siculus begins by noting that the primary advantage of history is that it affords important schooling for its readers without the dangers attendant to battle and travel. The primacy of history, he claims, over all other forms of literature is that it combines the effectiveness of rhetoric and style with the credibility of truth and fact. Of course, no one can participate in all events, especially in remote events. Therefore, a good historian must consult his literary predecessors. But, a good historian also ought to visit the primary sites. Diodorus claims to have travelled over a large portion of Asia and Europe in order to see with his own eyes as many regions as possible. He notes that too many errors have been made by the best of historians due to their lack of precise geographical knowledge. Having set these rather high standards and having laid claim to the aura of factual truth, Diodorus begins his history with an account of the origin of the gods⁽²³⁾.

(21) See GRANT, *The Ancient Historians*, 195-242, for references and analysis.

(22) DIODORUS SICULUS (trans. C. H. Oldfather) (LCL; Cambridge 1946) 1.1-5.

(23) DIODORUS SICULUS 1.6. Livy makes a pointed apology for the inclusion of stories about the gods: "But in matters of so great antiquity I should be content if things probable were to be received as true" (*Livy* [trans. B. O. Foster] [LCL; New York 1924] 5.21.9). "Such traditions as belong to the time before the city was founded, or rather was presently to be founded, and are rather adorned with poetic legends than based upon trustworthy historical proofs, I purpose neither to affirm nor to refute. It is the privilege of antiquity to mingle divine things with human, and so to add dignity to the beginnings of cities; and if any people ought to be allowed to consecrate their origins and refer them to a divine source, so great is the military glory of the Roman People that when they profess that their Father and the Father of their Founder was none other than Mars, the nations of the earth may well submit to this also with as good a grace as they submit to Rome's dominion" (*Livy* [trans. Foster] [LCL; Cambridge 1919] 1.pref.6-8).

Noting this kind of inconsistency and seeming contradiction, Emilio Gabba argues that "we are always inclined to exaggerate the cultural significance of 'elevated' history writing in antiquity. . ." ⁽²⁴⁾. Thucydides may have been the acknowledged canon of ancient historiography, but there was little understanding of what he did. Political history writing always coexisted with other forms of history writing. The novel and the romance, he argues, were actually considered to be lesser forms of history writing. In fact, the so-called dramatic histories were the most common and popular. Momigliano and Gabba explain the popularity of dramatic, uncritical histories as resulting from the strong fascination in antiquity with erudition and breadth of knowledge ⁽²⁵⁾. Even if the primary emphasis in classical historiography was not to chronicle, collect, and preserve ⁽²⁶⁾, historians in the Greco-Roman era catered to the public's growing fascination with erudition by focusing more on myths, legends, distant geography, the fantastic, and other forms of the exotic. It became important for historians to collect, preserve, and report the esoteric and unusual. Therefore, Livy and Diodorus detail the

⁽²⁴⁾ GABBA, "True History and False History in Classical Antiquity", 52. In this claim, Gabba is disagreeing with Momigliano ("Tradition and the Classical Historian," 14) who argues that Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus were indeed the models for most other ancient historians.

⁽²⁵⁾ On the conflict between erudition and Thucydides-style historiography, see also MOMIGLIANO, "Historiography on Written Tradition and Historiography on Oral Tradition", 216-217.

⁽²⁶⁾ MOMIGLIANO, "Tradition and the Classical Historian", 13-31, argues that concern for sources was not motivated by a concern to preserve a record of the past. In fact, Livy apologizes for detaining readers with remote events. Herodotus is not telling ancient history, but is explaining the consequences for his day of the war against the Persians. The key, Momigliano feels, is *change*. "The main emphasis of the historians was on the destruction of the past, on the emergence of new institutions, habits, and vices. . . The Greek and Roman historians were not supposed to be the keepers of tradition. They were not assumed to register events in terms of conformity to or deviations from the norm. They were not supposed to succeed each other in a profession supported by the state or by religious institutions, nor were they concerned with keeping change under control" (18-19). Momigliano's observations have obvious ramifications for the study of Acts. Luke is not attempting to chronicle the origin of the church but is defining and explaining the new reality expressed in that history.

origin of the gods in the style of Herodotus while paying homage to the strict criteria of Thucydides.

Momigliano notes that, although the classical historians did not attempt to chronicle the past, there were many local chronicles, collected and commissioned by cities and temples, which did just that. These "minor" histories were spawned by local pride, because cities and temples enjoyed remembering their past and celebrating their famous people and wonderful events. But, Momigliano believes these local histories, replete with legends and myths, were overshadowed and overwhelmed by the confrontation with the "greater" histories⁽²⁷⁾. Gabba, however, believes that Momigliano has greatly underestimated the influence and popularity of these local histories. He suggests that these local chronicles in fact dominated in popularity and influence the classic histories. He notes that these local histories were normally collected and preserved by cultic centers⁽²⁸⁾. The priests transmitted the ancient traditions about the origin of that city, the foundation of that cult and temple and the mysteries and rituals therein, and any attendant miracles and healings. There was rivalry between cities over their ancient legends, which increased the energy behind their production. Finally, guide books which compiled these local traditions from temple archives, inscriptions, monuments, and statues became popular. In fact, it was Christianity above all which popularized these guide-books. In Christian circles these books focused of course on churches and monasteries and the great legends attached to them. Therefore, it would have been natural for Christian churches from the very beginning to collect and preserve records and stories of their personal history. In fact, for them not to have done so would make them an aberration among cultic centers.

We are now in a position to imagine what situation might have existed concerning sources for Acts and how Luke might have proceeded. If the early church participated in any way in the tendency

(27) MOMIGLIANO, "Tradition and the Classical Historian", 22-25.

(28) On the formation of religious histories see GABBA, "True History and False History in classical Antiquity"; G. NADEL, "Philosophy of History before Historicism", *History and Theory* 3 (1964) 291-315; M. I. FINLEY, "Myth, Memory, and History", *History and Theory* 4 (1965) 281-302; and J. NEUSNER, "The Religious Uses of History", *History and Theory* 5 (1966) 153-171.

of cult centers to chronicle their founding and attendant miracles, then Christian churches would have self-consciously preserved or created the story of their founding, of their relationships to any and all apostles, and of any miraculous events. The degree of precision for how this was done would certainly have varied from church to church, but major centers, such as Antioch and Ephesus, would have a high probability of written records. When asked, the church in Ephesus could tell the story of its founding and of its relationship with Paul.

Luke admits in the prologue to Luke that he consulted both written documents and oral traditions⁽²⁹⁾. We can imagine that when he attempts to narrate events in the journeys of Paul he would immediately contact the churches involved. They would, it seems likely, have had a story ready to tell him. Therefore, Acts preserves for us, at least in part, the memories of the various churches mentioned therein of their founding and their relationship with Paul. It would be difficult if not impossible, however, on the basis of this imagined history of early Christian churches to say anything about the particular shape these memories might take. They could be written, oral, or some combination thereof. They could be stable or unstable. We simply do not have adequate information at this point to say much beyond affirming the probability of memories of some kind which were self-consciously created and preserved.

(29) On the function of Luke's prologue see H. J. CADBURY, "The Knowledge Claimed in Luke's Preface", *Expositor* 8/24 (1922) 401-420, and "Commentary on the Preface of Luke", *Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, Acts of the Apostles*, vol. 2 (ed. K. LAKE and H. J. CADBURY) (London 1932; Grand Rapids 21979) 489-510; I. I. DU PLESSIS, "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue (Lk i 1-4)", *NovT* 16 (1974) 259-271; J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (AB 28; Garden City, N. Y. 1981) 257-302; G. KLEIN, "Lukas 1,1-4 als theologisches Programm", *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an R. Bultmann* (ed. E. DINKLER) (Tübingen 1964) 193-216; S. BROWN, "The Role of the Prologues in Determining the Purpose of Acts", *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, 99-111. The concept of witness is important for Luke, since he grounds the credibility of the gospel on eyewitnesses. The main requirement in Acts 1,15-26 for replacing Judas is that the person have been a witness (*martyrs*) of the events from the baptism of John to the ascension. In the well-known programmatic statement in Acts 1,8 Jesus commands the disciples to be his witnesses (*martyres*). On witness in Luke-Acts see R. J. DILLON, *From Eyewitnesses to Ministers of the Word* (AnBib 82; Rome 1978); KLEIN, "Lukas 1,1-4".

III. A Pauline Testament in Ephesus

At this point it would be preferable to describe which cities had what type of traditions. We could go through the various stories in Acts and make proposals in each instance for what kind of local history might be the source. However, I do not know of an adequate way to systematically do that. There would be, to my mind, a number of ways to imagine how the text in Acts relates to local church histories. There are not sufficient controls for guiding a discussion of how a text like Acts, which is written too fluently and consistently for us to ascertain sources, might relate to local sources which could have taken many different forms. We simply cannot at this point give a systematic account of what kind of local histories underlie Acts.

Instead we shall attempt something more modest. We shall examine some corroborating evidence for the existence of these local histories. I will argue that the farewell discourse by Paul to the Ephesian elders in Acts 20,17-38 is based upon a tradition in Ephesus that Paul bestowed his testament upon them, entrusting them with special authority and specific responsibilities. The evidence for this does not reside merely in the belief that positing such a tradition explains nicely the peculiar shape and location of Acts 20,17-38, because 2 Timothy also seems to be based upon a tradition at Ephesus of this Pauline testament⁽³⁰⁾. That is to say, the striking agreements between the farewell of Paul to the Ephesian elders in Acts 20,17-38 and the farewell of Paul to the Ephesian elders through Timothy in 2 Timothy⁽³¹⁾ is not based upon the common author-

⁽³⁰⁾ J. MUNCK, "Discours d'adieu dans le Nouveau Testament et dans la littérature biblique", *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne*, Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel (Neuchâtel 1950) 155-170, has demonstrated that both 2 Timothy and Acts 20,17-38 are of the testament genre.

⁽³¹⁾ The parallels between these two passages have been noted many times: N. BROX, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (RNT; Regensburg 1969) 72-73; J. ROLOFF, *Apostolat-Verkündigung-Kirche. Ursprung, Inhalt und Funktion des kirchlichen Apostelamtes nach Paulus, Lukas und Pastoralbriefen* (Berlin 1965) 236-271; C. H. TALBERT, *Literary Patterns*, 95-96, and *Luke and the Gnostics* (Nashville 1966) 65-68; S. G. WILSON, *Luke and the Pastoral Epistles* (London 1979) 117-118. I have, in fact, attempted to read these parallels through the eyes of these scholars who are not testing the Ephesian testament hypo-

ship of Luke-Acts and the Pastorals⁽³²⁾ but upon two different authors using the same local church history in Ephesus.

The point of this examination is not to provide a complete analysis of either Acts 20,17-38 or 2 Timothy as testaments, but simply to demonstrate that positing a fairly stable church history in Ephesus, a history that took the general form of a testament, helps explain the striking similarities between the two, thereby providing some confirmation, based on the analysis of texts, of a theory derived from historical speculation.

The awkwardness of Acts 20,17, where Paul stays in Miletus while a messenger calls the elders from Ephesus to him for the supposed purpose of saving time, convinces some commentators that Luke is dealing with conflicting sources⁽³³⁾. He perhaps had, on the

thesis. The analyses of Talbert and Wilson together produce all the elements in the two analyses below in this article. Wilson, unfortunately, uses the parallels as part of his argument for Luke-Acts and the Pastorals having the same author. Talbert's thesis, that two different authors have similar problems with heterodoxy and authority, and thereby that some of their arguments follow similar lines, is more adequate. J. D. Quinn has offered renewed support for Lukan authorship ("The Last Volume of Luke: The Relation of Luke-Acts to the Pastoral Epistles", *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, 62-75). He analyzes the general agreements between Luke-Acts and the Pastorals and theorizes that the Pastorals are an epistolary appendix for Luke-Acts. Admittedly, the parallels between the two sets of documents are considerable, but so are the differences. Quinn's list of contradictions (73-74) is inadequate. In my opinion, common authorship is not probable.

⁽³²⁾ Thus, C. F. D. MOULE, "The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles: A Reappraisal", *BJRL* 47 (1965) 430-452; A. STROBEL, "Schreiben des Lukas? Zum sprachlichen Problem der Pastoralbriefe", *NTS* 15 (1969) 191-210; S. G. WILSON, *Luke and the Pastoral Epistles*; QUINN, "The Last Volume of Luke". Contra Lukan authorship is N. BROX, "Lukas als Verfasser der Pastoralbriefe?", *JAC* 13 (1970) 62-77, and most other scholars writing on the Pastorals.

⁽³³⁾ The thesis of a travelogue into which this speech is inserted apparently goes back to F. OVERBECK, *Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte* by W. M. L. de Wette, 4th ed. revised and enlarged by F. OVERBECK, *Kurzfassstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 1, part 4 (Leipzig 1845). M. DIBELIUS, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, 196-201, R. BULTMANN, "Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apostelgeschichte", 420, and H. J. CADBURY, "'We' and 'I' Passages in Luke-Acts", *NTS* 3 (1956-57) 128-132, follow Overbeck. More recently, T. L. BUDESHEIM, "Paul's Abschiedsrede in the Acts of the Apostles", *HTR* 69:1-2 (1976) 9-30, has repeated this argument. Budesheim argues that Acts 22,1-21 and 20,18-35 are two parts of

one hand, a travelogue which named Miletus and not Ephesus, and, on the other hand, a farewell discourse to the Ephesian elders. The existence of the travelogue will not be discussed here, but the curious method of including this farewell suggests a source of some kind that was tied to Ephesus. Luke's narrative had Paul in Philippi immediately before coming to Miletus (Acts 20,6); therefore, if Luke simply wanted to compose a farewell speech for Paul before his arrest in Jerusalem, he could easily have located it in Philippi. Perhaps he had received from Ephesus in particular this tradition of a farewell and he is being faithful to his sources.

The discourse in Acts 20,17-38⁽³⁴⁾ follows the classic pattern of a testament which we find in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*⁽³⁵⁾. In the testaments a typical pattern can be detected.

what was once an original speech, which Luke separated in order to express his particular scheme of the development of the early church. Budesheim's thesis is an interesting way to deal with the truncated look (from the viewpoint of the canons of rhetoric) of the speeches in Acts. In my opinion, this thesis creates as many problems as it solves and overreads the power of rhetorical rules on actual speeches. But Budesheim offers a little support for the thesis of this article when he remarks, while discussing the curious juxtaposition of Miletus and Ephesus, "It might be the mere proximity of Miletus and Ephesus that prompts Luke to locate delivery of this speech to the elders of that city. Nothing in the speech itself requires it. However, it could be that Luke has received this source from Ephesus, but that problem does not require immediate solution" (24).

⁽³⁴⁾ The literature on the speeches in Acts is extensive. See, for example, E. SCHWEIZER, "Concerning the Speeches in Acts", *Studies in Luke-Acts*, (ed. KECK and MARTYN) (Philadelphia 1980) 208-216; M. DIBELIUS, "Paul on the Areopagus", "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography", "Literary Allusions in the Speeches in Acts", *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, 26-77, 138-191; H. J. CADBURY, "The Speeches in Acts", *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 5: 402-427; and K. S. SACKS, "Rhetorical Approaches to Greek History Writing in the Hellenistic Period", *Society of Biblical Literature 1984 Seminar Papers* (Chico, CA 1984) 123-133.

⁽³⁵⁾ On the genre of the farewell discourse or testament see MUNCK, "Discours d'adieu dans le Nouveau Testament", 155-170; H. J. MICHEL, *Die Abschiedsrede des Paulus und die Kirche Apg 20,17-38: Motivgeschichte und theologische Bedeutung* (SANT 35; München 1973); A. B. KOLENKOW, "The Genre Testament and the Forecasts of the Future in Hellenistic Jewish Milieu", *JSJ* 6 (1975) 57 ff.; E. VON NORDHEIM, *Die Lehre der Alten. I Das Testament als Literaturgattung im Judentum der Hellenistisch-Römischen Zeit* (ALGHJ 13; Leiden 1980); and H. W. HOLLANDER, *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (SVTP 7; Leiden 1981).

There is a statement of impending death and a gathering at the bedside. The patriarch then rehearses his life, presenting it as paradigmatic for the listeners and readers. This paradigm can be both negative and positive: imitate this; do not imitate that. Then the patriarch makes predictions about the future (a future which is actually the present of the author) and issues warnings and exhortations for how to deal with those events. Paul's farewell follows the same basic format. But there is an idiosyncratic shape to this speech which cannot be predicted by the genre itself⁽³⁶⁾.

A. *An Analysis of Acts 20,17-38 as a Testament*⁽³⁷⁾.

1) Paul, as the genre would predict, presents himself as a paradigm to be imitated⁽³⁸⁾. Of course, his model is entirely positive; no vices are mentioned. The classic pattern permits this, but the specifics are based on ecclesiastical needs. The paradigm is shaped by the exigencies of leading a church. Paul's virtue is that he did not shrink back (*hypostellō*) even when confronted by trials (Acts 20,18-20.26-27). The speech depicts Paul as faithful to his calling to preach even when suffering persecution. He becomes thereby an implied model for any elder who is suffering persecution. This message is: be like Paul, do not flinch before persecution, be faithful to your calling.

2) Paul turns control over to the elders. He is leaving and therefore his oversight is ending. He bestows his authority upon the elders (not upon the church as a whole) and enjoins them with specific responsibility. They (the elders, *presbyteroi*) are to be bishops or guardians (*episkopoi*) who care for and feed the flock (Acts 20,28)⁽³⁹⁾. This passing of authority is not an unnatural com-

Hollander details and compares the various theories for how the testament was structured (1-16)

⁽³⁶⁾ Therefore, the similarities between Acts 20,17-38 and 2 Timothy are not based simply on the employment of the same genre. The parallels cannot be sufficiently explained in this way.

⁽³⁷⁾ See nn. 30, 31. See also HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 589-598; G. KLEIN, *Die Zwölf Apostel. Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee* (Göttingen 1961) 183-184; J. DUPONT, *Le discours de Milet* (Paris 1962).

⁽³⁸⁾ HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 596.

⁽³⁹⁾ The awkward combination of *episkopos* and *presbyteros* occasions

ponent for a testament, but it is not paralleled exactly in other testaments.

3) Paul predicts the coming of wolves, who will rise from within the church and who will not spare the flock. In fact, the flock will turn after them (Acts 20,29-30). The standard prediction motif is modified by the shape of heterodoxy-orthodoxy debates.

4) Paul promises that God will sustain them for this trial and will reward them in the hereafter (Acts 20,32).

5) As required by the genre, Paul's death is imminent (Acts 20,22-25.38). Paul dreams only of completing his course (*teleiōsai ton dromon*) (Acts 20,24).

We have then in Acts 20,17-38 a significant modification in the standard testament format. The announcement of death, the paradigmatic language, the predictions and exhortations for the future coincide with the requirements of the genre, but the specifics of the ethic and the predictions do not. The depiction of Paul as suffering persecution yet maintaining fidelity to his calling, the descriptions of heretics within the church, and the suggestion that many will follow these heretics belong more to the dynamics of early Christian heterodoxy-orthodoxy discussions⁽⁴⁰⁾. They reflect the kind of conflicts which Ephesus might well have endured after Paul. Perhaps the Ephesians used their memory of a Pauline testament as a vehicle to address these conflicts. And, of course, persecution and opposition were not foreign to the historical Paul. Furthermore, the implied transfer of authority, wherein the duty of caring for the church which once was Paul's but now is the elders', indicates that the Ephesian church remembered that their elders received apostolic authority via the Pauline testament.

Such a scenario in Ephesus would also help to explain the origin of 2 Timothy. 2 Timothy is a pseudepigraphical letter which pre-

many comparisons to the Pastorals. See HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 597. On the usage of the terms in Acts see BUESCHEIM, "Paul's *Abschiedsrede* in the Acts of the Apostles", 21-24; G. BORNKAMM, "Presbys", TDNT 6: 651-683; and H. VON CAMPENHAUSEN, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries* (trans. J. A. Baker) (Stanford 1969) 76-123. On the terms in the Pastorals see H. VON LIPS, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt: zum Verständnis der Ordination in den Pastoralbriefen* (FRLANT 122; Göttingen 1979) 106-121; J. P. MEIER, "Presbyteros in the Pastoral Epistles", CBQ 35 (1973) 323-345.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ W. BAUER, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (2nd ed., English edition ed. Kraft and Krodell; Philadelphia 1971).

tends to be written by Paul to Timothy, who is in Ephesus⁽⁴¹⁾. It is in fact a letter to beleaguered church leaders who have lost control of their church to "heretics". It exhorts these leaders to maintain their calling and uses Paul as a paradigm for how they might do that⁽⁴²⁾. It, like Acts 20,17-38, follows the basic pattern of the testament. And the parallels between these two testaments are striking.

B. *An Analysis of 2 Timothy as a Testament*⁽⁴³⁾.

1) Paul functions in 2 Timothy as a paradigm for how an abandoned and suffering church leader should behave⁽⁴⁴⁾. This is stated as a direct call to imitation in 2 Tim 1,13 and 3,10-12. Of course, paradigmatic arguments are more easily accomplished via descriptions of behavior. Thus the autobiographical reminiscences in 2 Tim 1,11-12; 2,8-10; 3,10-11 and 4,6-18 are the author's way of employing the figure of Paul for describing proper behavior. Paul is depicted in these paradigms as a suffering apostle, abandoned by even his closest friends, under attack within the church, who in spite of all this stays faithful to his calling by proclaiming the gospel. The reader is to understand that he⁽⁴⁵⁾ is to do likewise. The echoes of Acts 20,18-20.26-27 are clear.

2) Paul entrusts the care of the church to those elders selected

⁽⁴¹⁾ The Ephesian locale of 2 Timothy comes from 1 Tim 3,1 and from the known residence of the persons named in 2 Tim 4,19.

⁽⁴²⁾ The reading of 2 Timothy given here depends mostly on my own work in *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles* (HUT 22; Tübingen 1986). But see also V. HASLER, "Epiphanie und Christologie in den Pastoralbriefen", *TZ* 33 (1977) 193-209; R. J. KARRIS, *The Pastoral Epistles* (New Testament Message 17; Wilmington, Del. 1979); LIPS, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*; L. OBERLINNER, "Die 'Epiphanie' des Heilswillens Gottes in Christus Jesus", *ZNW* 17 (1980) 192-213; D. VERNER, *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles* (SBLDS 71; Chico, CA 1983).

⁽⁴³⁾ See nn. 30,31. See also H. KOESTER, *History and Literature of Early Christianity*, vol. 2 of *Introduction to the New Testament* (Hermeneia-Foundations and Facets; Philadelphia 1982) 300-301; E. KÄSEMANN, *Essays on New Testament Themes* (SBT 41; Naperville 1964) 86-87.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ On Paul as a paradigm in the Pastorals see DONELSON, *Pastoral Epistles*, 90-113; B. FIORE, *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles* (AnBib 105; Rome 1986).

⁽⁴⁵⁾ The exclusive gender is intentional. The author of the Pastorals does not countenance women in position of authority. See 1 Tim 2,9-15.

by Timothy⁽⁴⁶⁾. In 2 Tim 1,8 and 14 he enjoins them via direct imperatives to not be ashamed and to guard the traditions entrusted to them. In 2 Tim 2,1-7 he calls them (actually Timothy) to be strong and to be good soldiers. And through the fiction of commanding Timothy to appoint certain kind of leaders he defines these church officers as faithful men who are able to teach others. In 2 Tim 3,14 he calls them to continue in what they were taught, i.e., they should not be seduced by new ideas. And finally in 2 Tim 4,1-2 he commands them by the power of God to preach, correct, and exhort the church entrusted to them. It sounds like Acts 20,28.

3) Paul predicts the emergence of heretics from within the Ephesian church and exhorts the church leaders to stand firm⁽⁴⁷⁾. The entire section of 2 Tim 2,20-3,9 is devoted to describing the effectiveness and evil of these heretics and exhorting the leaders to rebuke them. They are depicted as having great success, for people will turn after them. In fact, the Pastorals use language similar to Acts 20,30 in describing the affection the church will have for these heretics.

4) The promise that God will sustain the elders who remain faithful is first of all implied in the paradigm of Paul, who was attacked, remained faithful, and was supported by God (2 Tim 1,12; 4,8.16-18)⁽⁴⁸⁾. God is described as providing a firm foundation (2 Tim 2,19), as capable of guarding the traditions until the final day (2 Tim 1,12), and as rewarding with the crown of righteousness all who keep the faith (2 Tim 4,8). The hymn in 2 Tim 2,11-13 describes God as rewarding the faithful and punishing the faithless⁽⁴⁹⁾.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ LIPS, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, 265-278; DONELSON, *Pastoral Epistles*, 162-170.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ R. J. KARRIS, "The Background and Significance of the Polemic of the Pastoral Epistles", *JBL* 92 (1973) 549-564; G. HAUFE, "Gnostische Irrlehre und ihre Abwehr in den Pastoralbriefen", *Gnosis und Neues Testament* (ed. K. W. TRÖGER) (Berlin 1973) 325-339; D. R. MACDONALD, *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon* (Philadelphia 1983); DONELSON, *Pastoral Epistles*, 116-128.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ On the portrait of God in the Pastorals see HASLER, "Epiphanie und Christologie in den Pastoralbriefen"; BROX, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 49-55; DONELSON, *Pastoral Epistles*, 129-141.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ The Pastorals do not use *pistis* to denote Pauline-style belief but to express reliability. See R. BULTMANN, "Pistis", *TDNT* 6: 174-228; L. P. FOLEY, "Fidelis, Faithful", *CBQ* 1 (1939) 163-165; LIPS, *Glaube, Gemeinde, Amt*, 25-53.

This is the same God described in Acts 20,32, who is "able to build you up and to give you an inheritance among all those who are sanctified" (RSV).

5) Paul expects to die; this is a farewell. 2 Tim 1,8.17; 2,9 refer to Paul's imprisonment in Rome. From 2 Tim 4,6-8 it is clear that Paul expects to die. In fact the claim in 2 Tim 4,7, "I have completed the course (*ton dromon teteleka*), parallels almost exactly the language of Acts 20,24. And 2 Tim 4,16-18 suggests that the trial is far along in its process. There might even be a parallel to the gathering about the deathbed or the rushing of the elders to Miletus in 2 Tim 4,9-21 where "Paul" enjoins Timothy to come soon and to bring Mark. "Do your best to come before winter" (2 Tim 4,21).

The parallels detailed above between Acts 20,17-38 and 2 Timothy obviously go beyond the minimal requirements of the testament genre. However, it might be argued that another factor is at work, namely, that both Luke and the author of the Pastorals were working in addition with common legends about Paul which included his suffering, abandonment, steadfastness, and prediction of heresy⁽⁵⁰⁾. Perhaps they both independently combined these legends about Paul with the testament genre, thereby producing these striking but not surprising parallels. It becomes then a question of judgment. Are these parallels deep enough to warrant a more involved solution?

Certainly, our thesis also explains the data. If Ephesus had produced a tradition about a Pauline testament which contained these several elements, then both the farewell speech in Acts and 2 Timothy are explicable. Both derived the tradition from the church history and employed it in vastly different ways. One combined this Pauline testament and its specifics with the genre of the pseudepigraphical letter, while the other combined it with the history speech.

The thesis of a fortuitous combination by two different authors of the testament with Pauline legends has two problems. The first is simply the historical and literary judgment that the parallels are too deep to be explained thereby. But the second involves the association of this fortuitous combination with Ephesus. That seems to be a rather unusual and inexplicable coincidence. Why would both authors pick Ephesus when there were so many other candidates, unless Ephesus itself claimed the association? Therefore, in my

⁽⁵⁰⁾ On these legends as employed in the Pastorals and the Acts of Paul see MACDONALD, *The Legend and the Apostle*.

opinion the thesis of an Ephesian church history, which included a tradition of a Pauline testament that was employed by Luke and the author of the Pastorals in independent ways, deals best with all the data. It explains the association with Ephesus; it explains the striking parallels; it explains the existence therefore of both Acts 20,17-38 and 2 Timothy.

And, if Luke were operating as a good historian, this is exactly the kind of resource we would expect him to uncover. Ephesus was a major Pauline center and therefore it was incumbent upon Luke to contact them before he began his narrative and ask them what happened. It would seem that Ephesus informed him of this Pauline testament, which they saw as a major warrant for their church officers and undoubtedly as a jewel in the crown of their reputation, and Luke inserted it, albeit transformed slightly, at the most appropriate place he could find in his narrative, viz., as Paul was sailing to his death.

Our imprecision in describing the imagined Pauline testament in Ephesus is intentional. We cannot overcome, using anything proposed here, the innate awkwardness of all source criticism in its attempt to imagine what cannot be recovered. Cult histories could take a variety of forms, and it is therefore not possible on the basis of the work done by Momigliano and Gabba to say what form the testament in Ephesus took. And the general parallels we have described between 2 Timothy and Acts 20,17-38 could be explained equally well by oral, written, stable, or unstable sources. I simply do not know of a competent way to be more precise. It would be my judgment in the instance of Ephesus that we are dealing with a written source, but there is in fact no way to adjudicate among competing claims in this area.

IV. Conclusion

At the beginning of his forty volume history, Polybius gives two salient reasons for undertaking a history of Rome. First of all, the advent of Rome and the majesty of its empire had changed the face of the world. Fortune (*tychē*), he was fond of pointing out, had accomplished wonderful things in his own time. And a new general history was needed because it is only by seeing the shape of the Roman world that one can understand how Fortune had been guid-

ing history towards this end. Thus, only from this new present can one correctly understand the past⁽⁵¹⁾. His first reason then is simply that the reality of Rome needs to be documented. Secondly, he notes that “no one, as far as I am aware, has even attempted to inquire critically when and whence the general and comprehensive scheme of events [regarding Rome] originated and how it led up to the end”⁽⁵²⁾. Instead his predecessors had focused on particular wars and particular events which covered only brief periods of time. No one had connected war to war or event to event in order to explain how and why Rome had emerged. He argued that these special histories (*hē kata meros historia*) were inadequate because one cannot perceive a whole from a part⁽⁵³⁾. “Special histories therefore contribute very little to the knowledge of the whole and conviction of its truth”⁽⁵⁴⁾.

Perhaps Luke encountered the same situation that Polybius did and thus entertained the same justifications for his narrative. The advent of Jesus and the emergence of the Christian churches, in Luke’s mind, had changed the face of history. So, like Polybius, first of all he must explain this new reality. To do this would require a general history which engages the whens, whences, hows, and whys of the Christian story. And, secondly, this article argues that Luke would have confronted a situation similar to Polybius’ in regard to his predecessors and sources. There would be extant a variety of local histories, many of which were written, and a variegated assortment of oral legends, reminiscences, rumors, and eyewitness accounts. It would be his task then to collect and systematize. In the collection process he would have followed the public canons of Hellenistic historians; he would have contacted the major cities and churches involved in the story along with as many eyewitnesses as possible (as he notes in his prologue). Acts then would be built upon the memories and chronicles of Christians and churches involved in the events.

Therefore, the tool of source criticism in examining Acts is not lost; it is only dulled somewhat. Admittedly Luke’s literary skills have buried his sources in a seamless narrative, and we cannot iden-

⁽⁵¹⁾ See n. 26.

⁽⁵²⁾ POLYBIUS 1.4.3.

⁽⁵³⁾ POLYBIUS 1.4.9.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ POLYBIUS 1.4.10.

tify sources with any degree of probability by simply detecting stylistic unevenness or missteps in the narrative. But we might proceed along the lines suggested in this article. And even if there are not many instances where we can discover independent confirmation of Luke's sources, as we did with the Pauline testament in Ephesus, we can assume for the most part that Luke did not make up his stories *ex nihilo* but rather built his narrative upon the stories of others. Unfortunately, this does not mean that we can be naive about the historical accuracy of these sources. These local church histories would have been liable to forgetfulness, exaggeration, and creativity. For example, we can only say that the church in Ephesus claimed direct apostolic warrant for its elders from the hand of Paul; we cannot say whether or not the historical Paul actually engineered a formal transference of his authority to those elders.

Our results therefore are quite modest. We have proposed that Haenchen and Hengel, who disagree on so much about the sources in Acts, are essentially right about their origin. We have proposed in addition that the work of Momigliano and Gabba on cult histories provides the best background for imagining what the author of Acts might have faced in terms of sources. We have further proposed that, even though we cannot say much about the specific shape of a given church history because of the stylistic evenness of Acts and the considerable variety which these local histories might take, we have some evidence, soft though it is, that Luke proceeded in the fashion we have imagined.

Austin Presbyterian Theol. Seminary
Austin, Texas 78705

Lewis R. DONELSON

SOMMAIRE

La critique des sources sur les Actes, vu la régularité stylistique de la narration, n'a pas pu identifier des sources en détectant des anomalies. Le présent article soutient, cependant, que la critique des sources sur les Actes est encore viable si elle procède d'une manière différente. Si des Eglises chrétiennes étaient caractéristiques de centres culturels gréco-romains, elles ont dû consciemment créer et préserver des souvenirs de leur fondation. Plus encore: si Luc était un historien gréco-romain typique, il a dû contacter ces Eglises. Finalement, il y a à l'évidence un testament Paulinien à Ephèse, parce que son existence expliquerait le parallèle frappant entre Actes 20,17-38 et 2 Timothée.

The Stones of Abraham: John the Baptist and the End of Torah (Matt 3,7-10 par. Luke 3,7-9)

I. Problems and Prospects

Any reconstruction of the ministry and teaching of John the Baptist, by the nature of the case, leaves itself open to criticism and dissent. Not only does such an endeavour face all of the difficulties met in life of Jesus research, but the possibility of a further "filtering" of the tradition by its use in independent Baptist circles, leaves us perhaps with what John Reumann has described as "only an echo . . . of his whisper"⁽¹⁾ — precious little to work with indeed.

An examination of the Baptist tradition will show, that while the New Testament uses a number of models to describe John, in one way or another, his ministry is always associated with that of Jesus. This is most easily explained, of course, by supposing that their ministries did in fact, share a common focus⁽²⁾. Yet, on the other hand, the material is very complex and diverse, so that, while one may not be convinced by Morton Enslin's argument that the paths of John and Jesus had in fact never crossed⁽³⁾, it would be shortsighted indeed not to recognize the pervasive influence of the Christian manipulation of the material about him. From the earliest traditions recorded in "Q" and the first chapter of Mark's gospel, to

(1) J. REUMANN, "The Quest for the Historical Baptist", *Understanding the Sacred Text* (ed. J. REUMANN) (Valley Forge 1972) 187.

(2) See E. LINNEMANN, "Jesus und der Täufer", *Festschrift für Ernst Fuchs* (ed. G. EBELING, E. JÜNGEL, G. SCHUNACK) (Tübingen 1973) 219-236. This is most clearly the position of Matthew's gospel (e.g. Matt 3,2; 4,17), a fact which is attributed to the consistent redaction of the evangelist by J. MEIER, "John the Baptist in Matthew's Gospel", *JBL* 99 (1980) 383-405; see also G. BORNKAMM, "End Expectation and Church in Matthew", *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (ed. G. BORNKAMM, G. BARTH, and H. HELD) (London 1963) 15-16.

(3) M. ENSLIN, "John and Jesus", *ZNW* 66 (1975) 1-18.

the redactional work of the last evangelist, the Baptist's words, deeds and destiny are presented within the context of Christian belief in the messiahship of Jesus. It is not surprising, then, that the four gospels will show a common subordination of John to Jesus. He reveals, looks forward to, prepares the way, and even begins the work of Jesus, but nowhere does he stand alone, as one apart from or outside the Gospel of Jesus and of the Church.

Because this notion of the Baptist's ministry as a preparation for and even consciously subordinate to that of Jesus is widely viewed as a part of the Christian ordering of things, as often as not, John's messianic preaching and the setting of his ministry within the context of the models proposed by II Isaiah and the prophet Elijah, are also rejected as historically reliable tradition, and often seen as having been developed within the context of Christian-Baptist sectarian controversy⁽⁴⁾. The one text to which scholars have almost unanimously turned as an example of the tenor of the historical ministry of the Baptist, because it is said to lack this Christological perspective, is the summary of this preaching found in the double tradition in Matt 3,7-10 par. Luke 3,7-9⁽⁵⁾. This is certainly one of the most

⁽⁴⁾ This is usually spelled out in regard to the Gospel of Luke and/or John; see: F. LANG, "Erwägungen zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Johannes der Täufer", *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie* (ed. G. STRECKER) (Tübingen 1975) 460; R. SCHNACKENBURG, "Das vierte Evangelium und die Johannesjünger", *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1958) 21-38; *Das Johannes-evangelium* (HTKNT IV/I; Freiburg-Basel-Wien ³1972) 228, 276; R. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John I-XII* (AB 29/I; Garden City 1966) LXVII-LXX; 46-54. While J. SINT ("Die Eschatologie des Täufers, die Täufergruppen und die Polemik der Evangelien", *Vom Messias zum Christus: die Fülle der Zeit in religionsgeschichtlicher und theologischer Sicht* [ed. K. SCHUBERT] [Vienna 1964] 95-102) does not accept the existence of a baptist group contemporary with John, the existence of such a sect in the first century as a whole has been seriously questioned by J. A. T. ROBINSON, "Elijah, John and Jesus: An Essay in Detection", *NTS* 4 (1957/58) 279, n. 2: For the more traditional view see J. THOMAS, *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie (150 av. J. C.-300 ap. J. C.)* (Gembloux 1935) 114-139; C. KRAELING, *John the Baptist*, (New York 1951) 158-187.

⁽⁵⁾ See for example J. BECKER, *Johannes der Täufer und Jesus von Nazareth* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1972) 109, n. 21 who is most quoted in this regard. Whether this supposed absence of Christological perspective does, in fact, manifest itself in this text is one of the questions we wish to address in this paper.

negative of the Baptist's sayings⁽⁶⁾, and together with the adjoining text (Matt 3,11-12 par. Luke 3,16-18), to the exclusion of almost all others⁽⁷⁾, has played a major role in the general perception of the ministry of the Baptist. In this respect, two interpretations of the text have been proposed, the one which understands John as an apocalyptic prophet of imminent doom, and the other, as the charismatic leader of an ongoing renewal movement within Judaism. Obviously he could not be both, but the tangle in the tradition is not easily unravelled. Nevertheless, because the text has been given such a great burden to bear, it is important that it be examined from every angle possible and its relationship to the remainder of the Baptist tradition spelled out and evaluated.

It is interesting within this perspective that the single reference that we find to John in a non-canonical first century work is in the *Antiquities* of Josephus, (18,5,2 #116-119) where both the messianic and scriptural patterns of interpretation, as well as the apocalyptic tenor of his preaching, are completely absent. As an exception to the patterns developed in the New Testament, the Josephus text takes on a special importance in any consideration of John's history. Of course Josephus is no more/less tendentious than our New Testament material, be it for different reasons⁽⁸⁾, so that his witness is neither to be set in opposition to the gospel accounts as the only neutral source, and thus become the yardstick against which we interpret those texts⁽⁹⁾, or completely discounted as biased in another

⁽⁶⁾ P. HOLLENBACH, "Social Aspects of John the Baptizer's Preaching Mission in the Context of Palestinian Judaism", *ANRW* II.19.1 (1979) 860, with reference to C. H. KRAELING, *John*, 49, a book that has become a standard in the English language.

⁽⁷⁾ See e.g., E. Bammel, "John the Baptist in Early Christian Tradition", *NTS* 18 (1971/72) 95-128; H. MERKLEIN, "Die Umkehrpredigt bei Johannes dem Täufer und Jesus von Nazaret", *BZ* 25 (1981) 29-46; P. WOLFF, "Gericht und Reich Gottes bei Johannes und Jesus", *Gegenwart und Kommendes Reich* (ed. P. FIEDLER and D. ZELLER) (Stuttgart 1975) 43-49.

⁽⁸⁾ See F. LANG, "Erwägungen", 460-461. For a generally more positive historical appreciation of Josephus' works see T. RAJAK, *Josephus, The Historian and His Society* (Philadelphia 1984) and H. R. MOEHRING, "Josephus ben Matitia and Flavius Josephus: The Jewish Prophet and Historian", *ANRW* II.21.1 (1984) 864-944.

⁽⁹⁾ ENSLIN, "John", 5. HOLLENBACH, "Social Aspects", 862, sees no reason to doubt Josephus in his conflict with Mark 6,20 and Matt 14,5.

direction⁽¹⁰⁾. Once consideration of those tendencies is taken, his notice may perhaps indeed bring a measure of balance to our understanding of the tradition process⁽¹¹⁾.

For the rest, an awareness of the broader political and socio-cultural dynamics of first century Judaism, and a sympathetic use of insights and models derived from other disciplines, suggest new perspectives for reading the material, and thus hold out the promise of bringing greater clarity to our attempts at unpacking the Baptist tradition, and if not solving, then at least somewhat further clarifying the literary, historical, and social problems which it reflects. We will proceed, then, by first examining Matt 3,7-10 par. in itself, and then seek to find a place for it in the developing tradition about John the Baptist. In the course we will pursue traditional methods as well as those models suggested by a socio-cultural understanding of first century Palestine.

II. Unpacking the Tradition

Because there are differences between Matthew and Luke in their renditions of this tradition about the Baptist, the question of redactional activity must be raised. It is fast becoming almost the custom to apologize for attempting this sort of criticism, either because it is felt that its traditional dependence on the two source theory of Synoptic relationships is no longer supportive of the method itself, or because our new understanding of the dynamics of textual communication make it irrelevant, at best. Yet the difficulty that each of these perspectives is having winning the day is reason enough to pursue a method which has indeed brought significant insight to our understanding of the gospel materials⁽¹²⁾.

It goes without saying, however, that the redaction of the evangelists cannot be considered from a purely literary point of view. While redaction criticism began as a literary methodology, its aims

⁽¹⁰⁾ As MERKLEIN, "Umkehrpredigt", 30, in an otherwise excellent article does.

⁽¹¹⁾ E. NODET attempts this in his article "Jésus et Jean-Baptiste selon Joseph", *RB* 92 (1985) 321-348, 497-524, where he sees a relationship between Roman Christianity, Josephus and the Gospel of Luke.

⁽¹²⁾ See e.g. the comments of MEIER, "John", 386, n. 13.

are as sociologically salient as are those of its parent, form criticism. We must therefore search for the two edges of the social dynamic which are inherent in the composition, reception, and handing down of texts and traditions within a society. For the text is to be seen not only as having been influenced, and indeed limited, by its original socio-cultural context, but also as interacting with its milieu and therefore creative of new contexts, some of which may be deduced or presumed from the patterns of socio-cultural exchange evident within the society of its origin. It is thus situated in a much broader framework for interpretation, no longer bound to the narrowly functional sense so often assigned it in the early periods of form and redaction criticism.

In the instance of John the Baptist, we are fortunate to have a rich and varied tradition which reflects the immediacy of the Baptist's pronouncements as well as the various settings and contexts of the on-going dialog that his person provoked. Not only the sayings of the prophet which are passed down in the tradition, but their various settings and contexts contain a treasure-chest of information. It is thus that contemporary form and redaction criticism can be used as part of a sophisticated attempt to avoid the reductionism which is often inherent in other methods which may be used independently of the historical/cultural perspective. It is in reality an attempt to avoid a kind of fundamentalism in which one can ignore the dynamic history of a text before it had become "sacred" through the process of canonization.

Within this perspective, therefore, there are three points of importance which must be examined: the saying attributed to the Baptist in v. 7b-10 (Luke 7b-9); the literary contexts provided for the saying in the New Testament (v. 7a of both Matthew and Luke, as well as its setting in "Q"); and the interactional contexts provided by the socio-cultural life of first century Mediterranean society.

In this respect, the difference between Matthew and Luke in v. 8 of the saying, ("fruit" as opposed to "fruits"), is seemingly a minor one⁽¹³⁾, but it can perhaps have important consequences for our in-

⁽¹³⁾ Aside from the addition of *kai* (v. 9), the only other difference between the evangelists is Luke's surely redactional use of *arksesthe legein* (v. 8, Matt: *doksete legein*), cf. Luke 3,23; Acts 1,22; 10,37; J. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (Garden City 1981) 464.

terpretation of the original saying, for it implies a concretization which can indeed change the reference of the text. That Luke has produced examples of the "fruits of repentance" in 3,10-14, which are fully lacking in Matthew, suggests that he has introduced the plural in v. 8 in keeping with his addition of these verses⁽¹⁴⁾. John's original demand, then, is to be understood with the singular: his hearers are to "produce the fruit of repentance".

More difficult to determine perhaps, is the original context of the saying (v. 7a), for the two evangelists differ substantially as to the receivers of the preaching which follows. Both agree that they had come out seeking baptism — a point worth noting at this juncture, for it will later be reason for reflection — but while Luke has John addressing the multitudes, Matthew limits his audience to the Pharisees and Sadducees, an unlikely combination, to be sure. As J. Meier⁽¹⁵⁾ points out, it is only Matthew in the New Testament who joins these two hostile groups together. This is, of course, not sufficient reason to turn to Luke for the original text, in spite of the fact that the supposed hypocrisy of the Pharisees, which is implied here, was certainly more of a concern of Matthew than of Luke. But the argument is not without its weight⁽¹⁶⁾, a point of view which has in fact been underscored in contemporary Matthean studies, and in particular, for our purposes, by the work of A. Fuchs on this very paragraph⁽¹⁷⁾. But is the combination of these two opposing groups necessarily of Matthean origin? After all, it is not a consistent oc-

⁽¹⁴⁾ Indeed there are good reasons to see Luke at work in the formation of these verses as well, see FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 464; MERKLEIN, "Umkehrpredigt", 36, n. 43; REICKE "Verkündigung", 56-57. The contrast with the singular *karpon kalon* in the parabolic saying in v. 9 is therefore all the more striking since it is probably from here that the image in the saying finds its origin. For another view see O. BÖCHER, "Lukas und Johannes der Täufer", *SNTU* A4 (1979) 31. HOLLENBACH, "Social Aspects", 867-875, completely ignores the possibility of redaction in these verses.

⁽¹⁵⁾ J. MEIER, "John the Baptist in Matthew's Gospel", *JBL* 99 (1980) 389 and n. 22. But see also Acts 23,1-10, the incident of Paul in the Sanhedrin.

⁽¹⁶⁾ R. BULTMANN, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford 1968) 53, sees it as reflecting a "specifying" tendency within the tradition process.

⁽¹⁷⁾ A. FUCHS, "Intention und Adressaten der Busspredigt des Täufers bei Mt 3, 7-10", *SNTU* A1 (1976) 66-68, with references.

currence in his Gospel⁽¹⁸⁾, nor is it inherently impossible that John provoked a reaction among the pious of Israel, among whom were numbered many Pharisees and Sadducees alike⁽¹⁹⁾. Furthermore, if Acts 23 is to be believed, both Sadducees and Pharisees managed to sit together in the Sanhedrin, despite their significant differences and in fact, had done so since the time of Salome Alexandra (76-67 B.C.E.), if not before⁽²⁰⁾. Our text simply implies that they had come among the crowd (v. 6) and not necessarily together, for that matter, if the text is meant to be a summary⁽²¹⁾. If John had indeed come "teaching in the Way of Righteousness" (Matt 21,32; Josephus, *Ant* 18.5.2), there is every reason to suspect that would have indeed been the case⁽²²⁾, if even they came only from a sense of outrage, to observe. Certainly Matthew, with his sensitivity to things Jewish, would have avoided any supposed tension inherent in the picture that he is said to have created⁽²³⁾. But on the other hand, one cannot fail to take into consideration the fact that the Lukan context also suggests the possibility of redactional work⁽²⁴⁾, so that on the whole, the most that can be said is that, while the exact wording of the *Vorlage* is unlikely to be clear, the core of the text unmistakably refers to an audience of great numbers⁽²⁵⁾.

This does not of course, necessarily place us, as it were, in the actual presence of John, or even lead us, for that matter, to the earliest setting of the saying in the Christian tradition. Form-criticism has taught us that the individual sayings in the gospels were original-

(18) But only once again, in 16,1.6.12.

(19) This is strongly contested by FUCHS, "Intention", 60-67, who stresses the unlikelihood of such a possibility. But he fails to give any reason for the Sadducees' inclusion in the verse at all. Certainly by the time of Matthew they were a spent force in Judaism, a fact which leaves one uncomfortable with the suggestion of J. Meier as well.

(20) See T. A. BURKILL, "Sanhedrin", *IDB* IV 215. By the Roman period, the violence which marked the relations between the groups during the time of the Hasmoneans, seems to have abated.

(21) See FUCHS, "Intention", 72, n. 35 with ref to A. Loisy.

(22) Whereas Matt 21,32 (par. Luke 7,30) speaks of the Pharisees as a class, this text speaks of "many" Pharisees.

(23) J. MEIER, *The Vision of Matthew* (New York 1978) 19-21, on the other hand, considers this to be one of the sure signs of Matthew's Gentile provenance.

(24) FUCHS, "Intention", 63-64, for details.

(25) FUCHS, "Intention", 65.

ly used independently in the life of the Church, an observation which urges us to seek a place for it in the tradition which is prior to the redaction of "Q", shaky ground, to be sure, but worth the risk for its promise. It is not impossible, for example, that the saying in question is a composite text⁽²⁶⁾ and perhaps even that its association with the Baptist himself, or with his practise of baptism, is a secondary one⁽²⁷⁾. That this is suggested by the "Q" redactor's joining to this the originally independent saying which speaks of baptism of water and fire (Matt 3,11-12 par. Luke 3,16-17)⁽²⁸⁾, is not to be rejected out of hand, for the present context is by no means demanded by the saying itself⁽²⁹⁾. In fact, in making the saying refer to those who were coming out to receive a baptism of repentance, and therefore already responding positively to John's preaching, "Q" has created an awkward situation, for v. 7b is then made to presuppose that those very people are guilty of a monstrous hypocrisy which, while acceptable and even favourable to Matthew and his over-all portrayal of the Pharisees, is able to be overcome by Luke only by his pleading ignorance on the part of the crowd (v. 10), a solution which is far from satisfactory. We would suggest therefore, that in Matt 3,7b-10 par. Luke 3,7b-9 we are dealing with a saying which was originally independent of the limitations of its present context, and therefore, may have entered the Baptist tradition and indeed have helped shape it from an entirely different perspective than that ordinarily presumed.

⁽²⁶⁾ See B. MARCONCINI, "Tradizione e Redazione in Mt. 3,1-12", *RivB* 19 (1971) 165-186, here 179-183; LINNEMANN, "Jesus", 218, n. 23.

⁽²⁷⁾ For BULTMANN, *History*, 117, 127, the saying is a Christian formulation. His view has unfortunately not been taken up by many. Fuchs, who sees this as Matthean redaction, provides a criticism of Bultmann ("Intention", 62, n. 1) which is rather onesidedly narrow, for he limits his remarks to the Pharisees and Sadducees and does not concentrate on the baptismal context itself. That elements of the saying appear as words of Jesus in Matt 7,19; 12,34 and 23,33 is not without importance in this matter. See MEIER, "John", 390.

⁽²⁸⁾ HOLLENBACH, "Social Aspects", 869, recognizes this as a 'misplaced' saying but is not able to come to grips with it in his exegesis.

⁽²⁹⁾ Also FUCHS, "Intention", 69. For HOLLENBACH, "Social Aspects", 859, all of John's preaching is made to people who have come out to him for baptism.

III. The Origin of the Apocalyptic Tradition about John the Baptist

We must at this point, return to an observation made earlier, namely, that of all the sayings attributed to the Baptist, this stands out as the harshest. It is set in the form of a prophetic oracle in which the wrath of God is at issue (v. 7), to be manifest in a judgement which is said to be sure, imminent, and utterly horrible⁽³⁰⁾. It calls to mind the depiction of the Day of the Lord in Amos 5,18-20 and the oracles in chapter one of the Book of Zephaniah (see esp. Zeph 1,15.18)⁽³¹⁾. The parabolic saying in v. 10 (Luke v. 9) suggests that those who stand under the judgement are powerless to avert it⁽³²⁾; what is possible, however, is to escape it by bearing "good fruit", a fruit which is further described as "befitting repentance"⁽³³⁾. Recourse to ethnic privilege, even that based on the promise to Abraham, is to no avail (v. 9). It is this last point which, in our opinion, puts into question any interpretation of the original saying, which sees the call to produce fruit that befits repentance as a call to return to pious living as is manifest in Torah obedience⁽³⁴⁾. There is no longer time for that. "The axe is already laid to the root of the trees"; the judgement is in fact already begun⁽³⁵⁾. Both the certainty and the nature of the already begun judgement calls for a complete turning away from the past and an abandoning of that which historically assured Israel of salvation, namely the election of

⁽³⁰⁾ MERKLEIN "Umkehrpredigt", 33; See also G. STÄHLIN, "orge", *TDNT* V 422-447.

⁽³¹⁾ See also Isa 13,9; Ezek 7,19.

⁽³²⁾ This point is well argued by MERKLEIN, "Umkehrpredigt", 33-34, to whom I am indebted for the main lines of this interpretation.

⁽³³⁾ It is possible that the saying attributed to John was, in fact, built on the parable in v. 10, reflecting as it does a motif found any number of times in the teaching of Jesus. Cf. Matt 7,16-21; 12,33-35; Luke 6,43-46.

⁽³⁴⁾ This latter, which is clearly the redactional interpretation of the evangelists is taken up as Baptist tradition by most exegetes, see e.g. HOLLENBACH, "Social Aspects", 858. To call the Pharisees to Torah obedience would be anachronistic in any case except that of factional polemics.

⁽³⁵⁾ MERKLEIN, "Umkehrpredigt", 33. To interpret *pros ten hrizan keitai* as anything less than the axe chopping down the tree seems to stretch credibility.

Abraham⁽³⁶⁾. For the prophet, Israel's historic prerogative now counts for nothing. His oracle is directed not to averting the disaster, within his perspective, that is no longer possible. It is an announcement of its impending arrival, and points to the urgency of producing a sign of repentance which recognizes that fact. In this circumstance for them to "begin to say" that as sons of Abraham they have a means of escape from the wrath to come marks them in the prophet's eyes as a brood of vipers, for therein is not the fruit of repentance that he seeks⁽³⁷⁾. The prophet is no longer concerned with an abuse of power, but with the source of power itself. At issue here is the means of salvation now that reliance on the media heretofore available to them as children of the Covenant (Abraham) is no longer fruitful⁽³⁸⁾. That this saying sets a distance between the prophet and his hearers is sure, since such a position would clearly place him at odds with the general assumptions about power within the Jewish community as a whole⁽³⁹⁾.

A closer look at v. 7b-8 would support this view, for that text seems to indicate that the saying is addressed to people who are indeed receptive of the prophetic warning of the end time. They are ready to "flee the wrath to come", and to repent as in the past. What they do not seem to accept, however, is the radical nature of the solution as proposed by this prophet, for the "fruit" of that repentance, with its turning away from the accepted channels of salvation given to them by God, is beyond them. In my opinion, such a reaction would have been perfectly legitimate, and indeed normal to the peasant class as well to the elites within first century Palestinian society, where Temple and Torah remained central even in the

⁽³⁶⁾ See FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 468.

⁽³⁷⁾ For MERKLEIN, "Umkehrpredigt", 36-37, the fruit of repentance is water baptism itself. In the context of the "Q" addition of v. 11-12, the emphasis on the judgement of fire (v. 7.12) taken together with the contrast between water and fire baptism in v. 11 makes this interpretation very attractive. See also P. WOLFF, "Gericht und Reich Gottes", 43-49.

⁽³⁸⁾ MERKLEIN, "Umkehrpredigt", 35; LANG, "Erwägungen", 462-463.

⁽³⁹⁾ For a discussion of Temple and Torah in the context of societal power structures see: S. ISENBERG, "Millenarism in Greco-Roman Palestine", *Religion* 4 (1974) 24-46 and IDEM, "Power through Temple and Torah in Greco-Roman Palestine", *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty. Part 2. Early Christianity* (ed. J. NEUSNER) (Leiden 1975) 24-52.

most radical of movements⁽⁴⁰⁾. It has nothing to do with the supposed hypocrisy of the Pharisees or the unwillingness of the people to repent. The response proposed by the prophet was simply not one of the options open to them, and, in fact, the scarcity of this type of saying in the synoptic tradition, as well as the settings provided for it by "Q" and the gospels, suggest that it became an embarrassment and was quickly toned down and abandoned at least in those circles.

We might, perhaps, at this point, seek a deeper insight into the dynamic reflected in this statement, by turning to the work of Robert K. Merton on social structure and alienation⁽⁴¹⁾. Merton provides a model for understanding the relationship between the dominant goals of a society and the means which that society provides for achieving them⁽⁴²⁾. Deviant behavior would reflect the existence of a certain imbalance between the two. In such a scenario John's appearance would be an almost natural response to conditions endemic in the social system⁽⁴³⁾. Thus, he becomes a challenge to those who, in their control of the redemptive media (i.e., basically those who control Torah interpretation), are seen to be responsible for what is judged to be the impossibility of the community to achieve its sought after goals. In dealing with the Matthean redac-

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Even at Qumran it was the contemporary experience of Temple and Torah use which was the issue, not the institutions themselves. See ISENBURG, "Millenarism", 38-39.

⁽⁴¹⁾ See especially R. K. MERTON, *Social Theory and Social Structures* (New York 1957) 131-194.

⁽⁴²⁾ The criticism of anomie theory by E. PFUHL, *The Deviance Process* (New York 1980) 94, may well be legitimate in a contemporary setting, but misses the point completely when applied to first century Israel where the universality of cultural goals and means was, in fact, a reality. For this see especially B. J. MALINA, "The Apostle Paul and Law: Prolegomena to a Hermeneutic", *Creighton Law Review* 14 (1980-81) 1305-1339, and IDEM, *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation* (Atlanta 1986) 131-138. In regard to anomie theory see also M. B. CLINARD "The Theoretical Implications of Anomie and Deviant Behavior", *Anomie and Deviant Behavior: A Discussion and Critique* (ed. M. B. CLINARD) (New York 1964) 1-56.

⁽⁴³⁾ According to PFUHL, *Deviance*, 149-150 (quoting R. QUINNEY [ed.], *Crime and Justice in Society* [Boston 1969] 26), the unequal distribution of power which marks any politically organized society would be met by an equally characteristic presence of conflict.

tion, with its struggle over the meaning of Torah, where the author was seeking legitimation of one scriptural interpretation (read: faction) over against another, John is presented in the guise of a reformer, one who clearly sets the scene for the new interpretation to be introduced by Jesus. Merton describes such a dynamic as an innovative adaptation to the situation, which would allow the group to maintain the goals and values of the society while at the same time (with impunity) rejecting the prevalent means provided to attain those goals⁽⁴⁴⁾. Now one must wonder whether the text of our saying itself does not go beyond this stage of innovation which is so clearly implied in Matthew's redaction. The destruction that is announced is not limited to the wielders of power or to one faction against another. It is to encompass the whole of Israel so that those, and only those who produce the fruit of repentance, will be saved. Thus the prophet is already seen to stand outside the community and its factions; the future of the social collectivity is the real issue, for the gist of the prophet's message is that Israel itself no longer has the means to be the salvation-community⁽⁴⁵⁾. Within the parameters of first century Jewish society, such a challenge to the nation would imply a total dispossession of the sources of its power and not simply a re-alignment of individuals or groups in their relationship to them. The text therefore does not represent an alienated group within society seeking resolution of its difficulty through innovative accommodation; it represents, rather, the rebellion of a radical Apocalypticism, with its vision of the destruction of the old order and its replacement by a totally new reality⁽⁴⁶⁾. The vituperative nature of the saying further suggests that the oracle may indeed be a reaction to the rejection which a previous prophetic pronouncement had already met, thus providing a perfect example of a type of neutralizing constraint described in deviance theory as the condem-

⁽⁴⁴⁾ See MERTON, *Social Theory*, 141-149; MALINA, *Christian Origins*, 122-126.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ MERKLEIN, "Umkehrpredigt", 34.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Rebellion implies not only a rejection of the values of a society but the substitution of new ones in their place. Besides Innovation and Rebellion, other modes of adaptation to anomie schematized by Merton would be: Ritualism, in which societal means are maintained even though goals are no longer accepted; and Retreatism, where both goals and means are rejected. Cf. MERTON, *Social Theory*, 139-157; MALINA, "Apostle", 1328; IDEM, *Christian Origins*, 124-126.

nation of condemners⁽⁴⁷⁾. By turning on his opponents and focusing on their alleged immorality, the prophet shifts attention away from his own proclaimed deviance and thus attempts to recoup his own honor as a prophet⁽⁴⁸⁾. But the question remains: have we heard in this the voice of the Baptist?

The question becomes a tantalizing one, for whereas a picture so radical is not even hinted at in the remainder of the Baptist tradition, it is reflected in other places in the New Testament. One thinks immediately of the Stephen group (Acts 6,12-14) and its relation to the Jews of Jerusalem; of the difficult text in 1 Thess 2,16 which speaks of the "wrath of God" descending upon the Jews; of the "Q" sayings in Luke 11,49-51 par. (attributed to the Wisdom of God) and Luke 13,34-35 par. (lament over Jerusalem). All of these, and perhaps the parable of the wicked vinedressers as well (Mark 12,1-12), are directed against Israel as a nation and utter a prophetic curse that is rarely found in other places in the tradition. O. H. Steck⁽⁴⁹⁾ has suggested that they reflect the situation of rejection faced by the early Christian charismatic preachers in Palestine, who see their own suffering and rejection to be in the pattern of that of the prophets, and of Jesus himself, and who now call down the wrath of God on a nation who refuses to accept their word of preaching. It is at least worth considering whether the Baptist tradition which is reflected in Matt 3,7-10 par. reflects this same movement, and whether the context of baptism original to the saying reflects not that of John, but the Christian baptism they offered.

IV. The Social Context of the Development of the Baptist Tradition

Having proposed at least a partial *Sitz im Leben* for our passage, we are now prepared to examine how this picture relates to the Baptist tradition over-all. As we have noted above, the interpreta-

⁽⁴⁷⁾ See PFUHL, *Deviance*, 65-68.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ We are dealing here with a case of achieved deviance, i.e., a status which "rests on the public meaning of one's accomplishment", and thus one which requires a public response. See PFUHL, *Deviance*, 162.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ O. H. STECK, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (Neukirchen 1967).

tion of John as a preacher of apocalyptic doom is never made explicitly in the New Testament except in this one text. But if Matt 3,7b-10 were indeed a word of the Baptist, one would be hard put to explain the total lack of comparable statements attributed to him in the New Testament, to say nothing of the witness of Josephus or the tenor of the remainder of the tradition as it has, in fact, developed. One might suggest, in the light of this evidence, that the evangelists, by providing broader contexts for this saying, have actually restored John to his rightful place. Be that as it may, an examination of the Baptist tradition indicates that, as in the case of Jesus, John and his preaching were rather controversial⁽⁵⁰⁾, so that it would not be without benefit to further investigate the tradition from the perspective of the Sociology of Deviance and more specifically of banning and labeling theory⁽⁵¹⁾. Accordingly we are dealing with the process by which moral meaning is assigned to behavior and by which specific behavior and/or persons are designated as deviant in relation to the norms of a particular society or group within society⁽⁵²⁾. John's place of dwelling, his clothing, practise of fasting and presumed celibacy all set him apart from his contemporaries almost irrespective of his preaching. To what extent this behavior would have disturbed what various groups perceived to be the order in society, is, therefore, a factor which must be fully accounted for in any evaluation of the tradition process.

On the one hand, both the gospels and Josephus seem to indicate that the general populace reacted in a positive way to his preaching and readily accepted his invitation to baptism. For the masses, his ascetical practise was a sign of moral superiority and thus provided legitimation for his message. This is the audience who would have provided a positive support for his position by claiming that John was a prophet indeed (Mark 11,32 par.). Thus what might, on the face of it, be considered deviant behavior is

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Both John 1,20 and Mark 11,29-33 clearly show that controversy was aroused regarding the mission of John. Cf. SCHNACKENBURG, *Johannesevangelium*, I 276. This, of course, bears out the theory that moral meanings are not inherent in the acts themselves, but derive from socially agreed upon interpretations of behavior. See PFUHL, *Deviance*, 1-36.

⁽⁵¹⁾ See PFUHL, *Deviance*, 121-159.

⁽⁵²⁾ See F. T. CULLEN and J. B. CULLEN, *Toward a Paradigm of Labeling Theory* (Lincoln, Nebraska 1978) and esp. PFUHL, *Deviance*.

judged to be positively significant to a large segment of the population, which would seem to indicate the presence among them of a deep dissatisfaction with contemporary norms⁽⁵³⁾. John's function becomes that of the moral entrepreneur, one who having perceived a sense of distress and a concomitant lack of any ready means for its dissolution, is able to provide a focus for the alienation this creates.

Although it is difficult to ascertain the full extent of John's influence on Jesus, it would seem that he would have been among this group of John's hearers. Jesus is said to have regarded him as "even more than a prophet" (Matt 11,9-11; par. Luke 7,26-28). He accepted baptism at the hands of John (Mk 1,9 par.), and may have for a time even joined him in his ministry (John 1,35; 3,22; 4,1). The New Testament in general, as well as Josephus, have also opted for the prophetic label, and in every case, on the basis of very different patterns than those suggested in the oracle in Matt 3,7b-10. John himself and his reputation (honor) are thereby seen to be closely related to many Jews as well as to Jesus and the movement led by him. The very presence of so much material devoted to him in the gospels and the pointed inclusion of him as a part of the Gospel message⁽⁵⁴⁾ is a sure sign of this.

Within an honor-shame society⁽⁵⁵⁾ this would have had foreseeable consequences. These are reflected in the diversity of the tradition which also presents him as having been rejected by the Chief Priests and Elders (Matt 21,23.32; Luke 5,29; 7,30 Pharisees and Lawyers), the very ones who, in their control of Temple and Torah interpretation, would have rejected outright any challenge to their authority as disruptive of the very foundations of the community. From their perspective, his ascetic practises were a sign not of moral superiority but just the opposite. The meaning attributed to this perceived deviance was that John had a demon (Matt 11,18 par. Luke 5,33)⁽⁵⁶⁾! As we have noted, the tradition suggests that this

⁽⁵³⁾ PFUHL, *Deviance*, 125.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Mark 1,1-15 par.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ For the concept of honor-shame and its pivotal position in first century Jewish society see B. MALINA, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Atlanta 1981) 25-50.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ In any case, whether this indicates a perception that John was possessed by demonic forces, or, as KRAELING, *John*, 11-12, maintains, himself in control of a demon, the charge reflects the pattern described as "witchcraft

accusation was made against the background of a popular respect for John, recognizing as it did an awe [fear] inspiring presence in his person. Consequently, this negative labelling is an attempt at status deprivation, the first step toward the ultimate goal of his expulsion from society whereby the purity of society, as they perceived it, might be maintained. As leaders in the social arena, it fell to them to assure that this initial recognition of his deviance was accepted by the community at large. John is not a prophet, as he is popularly perceived to be, he is a witch and must be stigmatized as such. The process begun by such a labeling would in turn lead not only to avoidance by the community, and ultimately, the total expulsion of the deviant person from society, but also to the enhancement of their own authority. That this former was ultimately accomplished only by John's untimely death at the hands of Herod would only add fuel to the fire, creating the kind of stumbling block that Paul speaks of in 1 Cor 1,22-23 with regard to the death of Jesus: What we have said is true; God does not abandon those upon whom his spirit rests, therefore the spirit that was within John must have been of the devil!

At the same time, we should expect that the counter-process of stigma management would have begun, for where such a process of relative definition of behavior exists in an honor-shame society, the concomitant is necessarily an ongoing challenge-risposte dynamic. Pfuhl refers to this entire procedure as "a moral enterprise of major proportions, calling for considerable management and initiative on the part of all those involved"⁽⁵⁷⁾. There is good reason to suppose, therefore, that both John and those associated with him and sharing in his sphere of "honor" would have been involved in this process of stigma management. It is within this context, we suggest, and not within the context of Christian-Baptist controversy, as is generally assumed, that the New Testament Baptist traditions had in fact developed. What they reflect is the process by which stigma is controlled and honor restored to a significant figure within a movement. Therefore to attempt to understand the Baptist tradition against the background of messianism and its Christian variation is to limit the

accusations" by Mary Douglas. See esp. the descriptions in *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Purity and Taboo* (New York 1966) 102-107, and *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (London 1973) 136-152.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ *Deviance*, 121.

parameters of study too severely to achieve any clarity about the impact of John or of his followers⁽⁵⁸⁾, and of the traditions developed and handed on by them.

V. Patterns of Development

In a society where status maintenance would have been of paramount importance, to label John "a voice in the wilderness" would be to speak in a radically positive way about him. In the light of his appearance in the desert, the tradition has here taken up the image of the evangelist of II Isaiah, a motif common not only to the Baptist and Christian movements, but to Jewish sectarianism as well, and thus has grounded his ministry in the plan of God. The same process is evidenced here as is manifest in the development of the passion apologetic⁽⁵⁹⁾. The purpose of such labeling is to legitimize what is otherwise seen as illegitimate, in this case, the (deviant) behavior of John, and to respond to the challenge of interpretations to that honor by those who sought to discredit his ministry and that of the group that formed about him. What is explicit in the body of the Baptist tradition, therefore, are the various patterns of interpretation by which his contemporaries and/or the Christian church sought to restore and maintain his honor and thus its own collective position within society. Thus we have not only the portrayal of John as an evangelist after the pattern of II Isaiah, a notion which indeed may stand as the one more likely than not to find its roots along the

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Such messianism is often construed as a reaction to social alienation. Anomie theory can only partially explain that phenomenon, and more specifically, in its more radical sectarian manifestations. But we have no clear evidence that the Baptist movement ever took that form. We should be willing to concede that the messianic question, no matter how important to later Christian theology, is a rather limited perspective, brought to bear only within certain sections of Jewish society, and spearheaded, within the Christian movement at least, by the post-Easter fascination with the Son of David/God theology. In that case, even within the Christian sphere, the messianic conflict model would seem to reflect a rather narrow perception of the Baptist dynamic.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ B. LINDARS, *New Testament Apologetic* (Philadelphia 1961), represents an early discussion of this dynamic in the development of early Christian doctrine, but his interest is not specifically social.

Jordan's shores, but also as the Elijah redivivus, and, clearly within the Christian sphere, as fore-runner of the *Kyrios Iesous*, and finally as a witness to Jesus the earthly messiah.

The John/Elijah pattern, fraught with ambiguity as it is, was perhaps the most fruitful attempt at this, used not because Elijah was widely expected as forerunner of the Messiah⁽⁶⁰⁾, but because of the availability of this radical figure for exploitation at the popular level, a "troubler of Israel" from the past, who himself had appeared as a social misfit, yet was destined to loom so large in the history of the nation.

Quite a bold step to take, to be sure. Matt 11,14 would seem to indicate that it was in place even during the ministry of Jesus⁽⁶¹⁾. It may indeed have been⁽⁶²⁾. Noteworthy is the absence in this text of any reference to the Isaiah type which other references to Elijah seem to incorporate, a possible inference of its antiquity. The difficulty with the sayings within this model, however, suggests a further development within the Christian movement here, focused within post-Easter eschatological speculation which, by its assimilation of the earlier Isaiah/Evangelist model, became finally crystallized in the idea that this John/Elijah is the precursor to the Messiah who is *Kyrios Iesous*. Finally, the inner-Christian dynamic of developing Christology can be seen in the image of John as witness to the Messiah Jesus, even during his lifetime, an idea that is already stripped of a futurist eschatology as is most of John's Gospel. But this is a program for further research.

University of Ottawa
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1N 6N5

Carl R. KAZMIERSKI

⁽⁶⁰⁾ The widely accepted view that Elijah was expected as a precursor to the Messiah in first century Judaism has been convincingly disproved by M. FAIERSTEIN, "Why Do the Scribes Say That Elijah Must Come First?", *JBL* 100 (1981) 75-86. Objections to F's position by D. C. ALLISON, Jr., "Elijah Must Come First", *JBL* 103 (1984) 256-258, have been answered by J. FITZMYER, "More About Elijah Coming First", *JBL* 104 (1985) 295-296.

⁽⁶¹⁾ F. LANG, "Erwägungen", 465, considers this John/Elijah association to have originated with Jesus himself.

⁽⁶²⁾ See also Mark 9,10-12 where John is associated with the contemporary Jewish pattern of the suffering Elijah. Cf. R. PESCH, *Das Markusevangelium* (HTKNT II/2; Freiburg 1977) 79-82.

SOMMAIRE

Une étude historico-critique du texte, prenant en considération des données socio-culturelles, suggère que le passage de Mt 3,7-11 et par. peut être entré dans la tradition chrétienne à partir d'une autre perspective que celle habituellement supposée. Aussi sa relation à Jean-Baptiste et aux autres traditions le concernant doit-elle être sérieusement reconsidérée. En outre, on montre que la Sociologie de la Déviance («labeling theory»: théorie du catalogage) fournit un modèle plus satisfaisant, pour comprendre le développement complexe de la tradition baptiste comme un tout, que le modèle, plus communément accepté, de la controverse messianique.

L'argumentation paulinienne en Rm 9 *

L'argumentation de Rm 9 a déjà suscité de nombreuses discussions: les difficultés syntaxiques⁽¹⁾, les procédés littéraires⁽²⁾ et exégétiques⁽³⁾, les citations bibliques⁽⁴⁾, l'existence possible d'un modèle midrashique⁽⁵⁾, tels sont quelques-uns des champs défrichés par la critique contemporaine.

Sans nier l'intérêt des recherches précédentes, c'est dans une autre direction que nous irons, en proposant un nouveau modèle, interne au texte⁽⁶⁾. Nous pourrons ainsi vérifier—infirmer ou confirmer—

* Cet article est la reprise, développée, d'une intervention faite au cours d'un séminaire sur «Paul et Israël» à la 41^e assemblée générale de la SNTS à Atlanta, Georgia, en août 1986.

(1) Cf. en particulier les v.22-24 (quelle est la nuance du participe *thelōn*: concessive, causale, finale? Comment interpréter l'anacoluthé?), sur lesquels l'unanimité est loin d'être faite.

(2) Surtout la diatribe des v.14-21. Cf. S. K. STOWERS, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (SBL Dissertation Series 57; Ann Arbor, Michigan 1981) 79-118.

(3) Les règles utilisées par l'exégèse juive: la *gezerah shawah* de 9,26-27 (pour Os 2,1 LXX et Is 10,22-23) et, selon certains exégètes, les *pesharim* de 9,8 (cf. le *tout' estin*) et 9,24 (vu comme une actualisation des prophéties auxquelles les versets précédents font allusion).

(4) Surtout celles des v.22 et 25-26. Au v.22, les vases sont-ils *objets* de la colère divine (et s'agit-il d'Israël?) ou *instruments* de cette même colère (cf. l'interprétation récente de J. A. BATTLE, «Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:25-26», *GraceTheolJourn* 2 [1981] 115-129 et de A. T. HANSON, «Vessels of Wrath or Instruments of Wrath», *JTS* 32 [1981] 433-443)? Au v.25-26, Paul applique-t-il le passage d'Os 2,1 LXX aux convertis du paganisme?

(5) Cf. E. E. ELLIS, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic* (Tübingen 1978) 218-219; R. VINCENT, «Derash homilético en Romanos 9-11», *Salesianum* 42 (1980) 751-788; W. R. STEGNER, «Romans 9,6-29 — A Midrash», *JSNT* 22 (1984) 37-52.

(6) Le modèle midrashique, dont STEGNER, «Rm 9,26-29», a montré l'importance, n'est pas le seul à structurer le passage, comme nous allons le voir. Est-il besoin de rappeler que les écrivains du N.T. peuvent utiliser conjointement plusieurs modèles ou structurations. Cf. B. STANDAERT, «La rhétorique

certaines interprétations et donner tout le relief qu'il mérite à ce chapitre complexe.

1. Une structure concentrique

Les v. 6-29 sont manifestement concentriques, comme le montre le tableau suivant:

$A = 6-9$	<i>Israel</i> v.6 (2x) <i>sperma</i> v.7 (2x).8
$B = 10-13$	<i>agapan</i> v.13
$C = 14-18$	<i>eleein</i> v.15 (2x).16.18 <i>thelein</i> v.[16].18 (2x) <i>dynamis</i> v.17 <i>endeiknysthai</i> v.17
$C' = 19-24$	<i>thelein</i> v.22 <i>endeiknysthai</i> v.22 <i>to dynaton</i> v.22 <i>to eleos</i> v.23
$B' = 25-26$	<i>agapan</i> v.25 (2x)
$A' = 27-29$	<i>Israel</i> v.27 (2x) <i>sperma</i> v.29

a) Les limites du passage

La structure concentrique a donc la même extension que le modèle midrashique (v.6-29), confirmant par là-même le terminus ad quem (v.29) de la première section de Rm 9-11.

Certains commentateurs, peu nombreux il est vrai, continuent de considérer 9,30-33 comme une conclusion. Ces versets donnent en effet la raison de la situation d'Israël (ils ont refusé de croire en Jésus Christ), à la manière d'une conclusion, et Rm 10,1 semble

ancienne dans Saint Paul», *L'Apôtre Paul*. Personnalité, style et conception du ministère (éd. A. VANHOYE) (Leuven 1986) 78-92, qui, eu égard à la dimension rhétorique, indique trois types de structuration: rhétorique, dramatique et concentrique (86).

amorcer une nouvelle étape dans l'argumentation⁽⁷⁾. Mais les indices fournis par les deux types de structure (midrashique et chiasique) sont trop nets pour qu'on passe outre, d'autant que 9,30-10,21 forme une réelle unité littéraire, structurée concentriquement elle aussi⁽⁸⁾.

Quant au terminus a quo, tous les commentateurs le mettent au v.6a⁽⁹⁾, qui est une *propositio*⁽¹⁰⁾ déterminant le thème ou la question débattue: en 9,6-29 il s'agira de Dieu, de sa Parole et de cela avant tout⁽¹¹⁾.

b) Chiasme et argumentation

La composition concentrique ne régit pas seulement le vocabulaire, elle englobe aussi le style et la logique du passage. En effet, si les unités de la périphérie (*A*, *B* et *B'*, *A'*) énoncent les décisions et choix divins en leur continuité, les sections centrales (*C* et *C'*) s'interrogent sur leur bien fondé à l'aide du style diatribique:

A, *B* choix divins

C, *C'* questions et réponses sur Dieu et sa justice (diatribe)

B', *A'* choix divins

On a coutume d'identifier le centre spatial et le centre sémantique d'une composition concentrique. C'est aller un peu vite en beso-

(7) Noter également que l'apostrophe «frères» accompagne plusieurs fois le début d'un développement. Cf. Rm 7,1; 8,12; 12,1; 1 Co 10,1; 12,1; 15,1; 2 Co 8,1; Ga 6,1; Ph 3,1; 1 Th 2,1; 4,1.13; 5,1; 2 Th 2,1.13; 3,1.6.

(8) *A* = 9,30-33; *B* = 10,1-18; *A'* = 10,19-21, avec une inclusion: *Israel / ethnē* en 9,30-31 et *Israel / (ouk) ethnōs* en 10,19.21. Noter qu'en 9,6-29 Dieu est le seul à agir et parler, avant et indépendamment de toute réponse humaine, alors qu'à partir de 9,30 Paul considère les désirs et les réactions des hommes (Israël et les nations). Rm 10,1 commence donc bien un développement (*B* = 10,1-18), mais pas une section.

(9) Rm 9,1-5 est unanimement compris comme une introduction à la section 9-11. Mais personne ne mentionne le lien entre ces versets et la section précédente, surtout Rm 8, qui par ses propositions fortes provoque les interrogations de Paul. En effet, si les chrétiens (venant du judaïsme et du paganisme) sont fils (8,4.19.29.32; cf. *hyiothesia* en 8,15.23) enfants de Dieu (Rm 8,16.17.21), appelés (*kaleisthai* Rm 8,30) à la gloire et déjà glorifiés (Rm 8,18.21.30), que devient Israël, défini dans l'Écriture par la filiation, la gloire, etc.?

(10) Cf. Les divisions du discours dans la rhétorique ancienne. Le livre de F. SIEGERT, *Argumentation bei Paulus an Röm 9-11* (WUNT 34; Tübingen 1985) pourtant consacré au modèle rhétorique, ne dit absolument rien sur le rôle des *propositiones*!

(11) Raison supplémentaire pour exclure 9,30-33 de la section.

gne. Ici néanmoins, les répétitions rhétoriques, le nombre de versets consacrés à la justice divine, eu égard à l'ensemble de la section, indiquent bien que les unités *C* et *C'* constituent la pointe de Rm 9,6-29. L'accentuation théologique souligne d'ailleurs la cohérence de l'apôtre, puisqu'elle confirme le v.6a comme *propositio*.

Notons l'élégance de la construction. Paul place au centre la réflexion sur les voies de Dieu: il était difficile de poser les questions sur la justice divine dès les premiers versets, sans en exposer auparavant les décisions concrètes; il était également peu pédagogique de terminer par des questions graves sans y répondre de façon développée — à l'aide de l'Écriture, pour prouver et illustrer l'infaillibilité de la parole divine.

Mais les parallélismes chiasmiques n'interdisent pas une réelle progression dans l'argumentation. 1) Au niveau temporel: Paul commence avec Abraham, Isaac, puis Jacob, Esau (temps des Patriarches), mentionne ensuite Moïse et Pharaon (temps de l'Exode) et termine avec son époque, celle de l'appel des païens — et des judéo-chrétiens qui constituent le Reste d'Israël. En un raccourci saisissant la section passe donc du tout *début* de l'histoire d'Israël au temps de l'apôtre (déjà temps de la *fin*), mettant en relief la cohérence de la parole divine. 2) Au niveau de l'extension: les unités *A* et *B* mentionnent des *individus*, membres d'une petite famille, alors que *B'* et *A'* parlent de *peuples*⁽¹²⁾. 3) Au niveau des acteurs non élus: le début de la section (*A*) note seulement qu'ils ne sont pas tous enfants, ni fils de la promesse, sans connotation négative aucune, mais, à la fin de *B*, la non-élection s'accompagne de sentiments négatifs (Esau haï⁽¹³⁾), *C* va encore plus loin, parlant d'endurcissement (Pharaon),

(12) Cette progression dans l'extension explique pourquoi 9,12 ne cite pas entièrement Gen 25,23 (*duo ethnē en tē gastri sou eisin, kai duo laoi ek tēs koilias sou diastalēsontai, kai laos laou hyperexei, kai ho meizōn...*): Paul aurait pu utiliser le terme *laos*, enrichissant ainsi le parallélisme des unités *B*, *B'* — au détriment de la progression.

En plus du rapport Israël/nations la section finit avec le renvoi à deux villes, Sodome et Gomorrhe, détruites *au temps d'Abraham*: l'unité finale conjoint donc l'aujourd'hui (temps du Reste et du salut annoncé) et le commencement, *A'* et *A*.

(13) Les commentateurs notent que le verbe reflète une exagération typiquement sémitique et signifie «aimer moins» (cf. Lc 14,26). Ils ont raison. Mais ce verbe fort sert le dessein de l'apôtre en lui permettant de déclencher les questions sur la justice divine. Avant de renvoyer à des situations histo-

C' de perdition imminente (des vases) et *A'* termine avec une allusion à la destruction effectuée (de Sodome et Gomorrhe).

Le thème de l'appel, qui sert de fil directeur à l'argumentation, se trouve aussi progressivement approfondi, et il est inutile de s'y attarder, car cela est amplement développé par les commentateurs. Remarquons cependant que le verbe *kaleisthai* utilisé en *A*, *B* n'apparaît pas dans les unités centrales⁽¹⁴⁾ sinon au v.24, qui déclenche *B'*:

A *klēthēsetai* 7b
B *tou kalountos* 12
C, C' ...
 ekalesen 24
B' *kalesō* 25
 klēthēsontai 26

La raison de cette absence est obvie: les unités *C* et *C'* s'interrogent sur la justice divine eu égard à ceux qui ne sont pas appelés (cf. v.17.22). Regardons de plus près ces deux unités centrales pour déterminer leur fonction dans l'argumentation.

riques, les acteurs et les relations décrites ont une fonction rhétorique qu'il importe de relever. Nous devons appliquer cette règle à Pharaon (*C*), aux vases tout prêts pour la perdition (*C'*) et à Sodome-Gomorrhe (*A'*).

⁽¹⁴⁾ STEGNER, «Midrash», 40-41, observe que cette absence est due au fait que, comme les commentateurs juifs, *Paul ne cite qu'une partie du verset*, même si le mot-clé se trouve dans l'autre moitié ou dans le verset suivant. Ainsi Rm 9,13 cite Ml 1,2-3 et *kalein* se trouve en Ml 1,4; Rm 9,15 reprend Ex 33,19 où *kalein* apparaît également. La raison donnée par Stegner ne vaut pas ici, car en Ml 1,4 et Ex 33,19 le verbe *kalein* a un sens tellement différent de celui donné par Paul en Rm 9 qu'il fallait l'omettre, sous peine de confusion.

Dans le corpus paulinien, le verbe *kalein* (*klēsis* et *klētos* également) renvoie presque toujours à la vocation chrétienne. En Rm 9,24.25.26 tel est bien le cas, mais les deux premiers emplois (Rm 9,7.12) ont une acception plus large, même s'ils préparent celle des versets 24-26. On aura sans doute noté la présence du vocabulaire d'élection (*eklogē*) au v.11; les deux racines *eklegein* et *kalein* manifestent l'aspect *énonciatif* des verbes, et dans un chapitre où tout dépend de la parole divine, cette présence n'est certainement pas fortuite. *Ek-legein* connote davantage la préférence, le choix d'un être parmi d'autres, et si *kalein* revient plus souvent en Rm 9, c'est parce qu'il a chez Paul une *connotation créatrice* nette (cf. Rm 4,17): lorsque Dieu appelle, il fait exister. Et comme en Rm 9 il est question de naissances, ce verbe exprime adéquatement la force créatrice de la parole divine.

2. Les unités centrales (C et C')

Ici encore l'apôtre utilise les parallélismes chiasmiques:

- v.14: question rhétorique (*ti oun eroumen*;)
 question sur une possible injustice divine
- | | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|--|
| a = 15-16 | <i>eleein</i> (3x) | insistance sur la miséricorde, qui vient de la seule initiative divine et non des efforts de l'homme |
| b = 17 | <i>endeiknysthai ten dynamin mou</i> | finalité théologique de l'endurcissement |
| c = 18 | <i>hon... hon de..</i> | sorts différents déterminés par sa seule volonté |
- v.19-20: adresses rhétoriques (*erëis moi oun et ò anthrôpe*)
 questions sur la logique divine (*ti eti memphetai; tis anthesteken*;))
- | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| c' = 21 | <i>ho men... ho de...</i> | sorts différents déterminés par la puissance créatrice |
| b' = 22 | <i>endeiknysthai to dynaton autou</i> | finalité théologique et patience ⁽¹⁵⁾ |
| a' = 23 (24) | <i>eleos</i> | dessein miséricordieux et inouï (non seulement juifs mais aussi païens) |

L'inclusion formée par le verbe *eleein* (v.15a) et le substantif *eleos* (v.23a) montre bien que le thème englobant est celui de la miséricorde: les affirmations sur l'endurcissement de Pharaon (v.17) et sur les vases tout prêts pour la perdition (v.22)⁽¹⁶⁾ sont chaque

⁽¹⁵⁾ Le syntagme *en pollē makrothymia*, qui détermine l'interprétation du passage, a été compris de trois façons différentes (cf. le status quaestionis fait par M. THEOBALD, *Die überströmende Gnade* [FzB 22; Würzburg 1982] 142-149 et F. REFOULÉ «... Et ainsi tout Irsael sera sauvé» [Paris 1984] 248-249): 1) la patience comme délai de grâce pour que les pécheurs se convertissent (cf. Rm 3,26; Sg 12,20). Mais le contexte, qui pointe sur la libre volonté divine, *avant toute réponse humaine*, semble interdire cette solution; 2) la patience comme moyen permettant la croissance du péché jusqu'à ses limites extrêmes (cf. 2 Mc 6,13-15; Sg 19,4): hypothèse également suspecte, pour les mêmes raisons; 3) la patience qui fait mûrir le dessein salvifique de Dieu (le retard de la destruction vient de ce que Dieu voulait faire miséricorde aux païens). Cette dernière proposition cadrerait mieux avec le contexte.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Le parallélisme existant entre *skeuē orgēs / skeuē eleous* et l'absence totale de relation *horizontale* entre individus ou peuples (seule est mentionnée celle, *verticale*, entre Dieu et ses créatures) interdisent la traduction de *skeuē*

fois mises en relation avec celles sur la miséricorde et leur sont ordonnées.

Mais si l'argumentation va de la miséricorde à la miséricorde, un autre thème donne au précédent sa pertinence et sa force, celui du libre vouloir divin, exprimé par le verbe *thelein* (v.18 [2x] et 22), le substantif *boulēma* (v.19) et, au v.15, la citation d'Ex 33,19 traduite excellemment par la *TOB*: «je ferai miséricorde à qui *je veux* faire miséricorde et je prendrai pitié de qui *je veux* prendre pitié». C'est en effet cette libre initiative qui permet à Paul de répondre à l'objection sur les choix divins: si Dieu fait miséricorde ou endurecit avant tout effort humain, avant toute réponse méritant récompense ou rejet, il n'y a pas d'injustice. C'est la même liberté du créateur qui juggle l'objection d'inconsistance (pourquoi se plaint-il de nos comportements puisqu'il les détermine à l'avance): que dire⁽¹⁷⁾ devant sa patience et l'inouï de son dessein salvifique? La pointe est manifestement *théologique*.

Il a été maintes fois dit que l'apôtre répond à ses propres objections des v.14 et 19 sans originalité, en répétant, comme le judaïsme de son époque, les réponses de l'AT. Rien de plus vrai, et pour cause: c'était à la parole de Dieu de montrer sa propre cohérence! Mais les unités *CC'* ne se présentent pas seulement comme une réponse traditionnelle sur la liberté totale de Dieu envers ses créatures. Car Paul ne pouvait pas prouver la *propositio* de 6a en raisonnant seulement sur le concept d'Israël, autrement dit en montrant que depuis le commencement Israël n'était pas identique à la descendance en sa totalité — distinction qui préparait les affirmations sur l'Israël-Reste et donc sur les judéo-chrétiens. Que les judéo-chrétiens soient le Reste, l'Israël élu, et qu'ainsi la parole de Dieu n'ait pas failli, laisse en effet entier le problème de l'appel gracieux des païens que rien apparemment ne préparait et qui semble marquer un net changement dans l'économie du salut. On voit aussitôt l'importance du v.15, que Paul n'utilise pas uniquement pour proclamer la souveraine liberté et

orgēs par «vases *instruments* par lesquels la colère divine va s'exercer» (contre Israël ou qui que ce soit).

⁽¹⁷⁾ La construction des v.22-24 (conditionnelle non suivie d'une principale) se rencontre plusieurs fois dans le N.T., également en grec classique (cf. BLASS-DEBRUNNER, § 482). L'anglais traduit «what if...», tournure malheureusement inutilisable en français («quoi donc, si...») qui exige qu'on supplée par le verbe «dire» ou même le *antapokrinesthai* du v.20.

justice divine. La citation d'Ex 33,19, telle une prophétie, annonce la miséricorde inouïe des v.23-24, montrant de façon idoine que le dessein divin ne doit rien au hasard ou à l'échec: dès l'Exode, dès le commencement donc, Dieu proclamait que sa miséricorde seule expliquait le choix de ceux qu'elle atteignait — et atteindrait.

3. Les unités finales (*B'* et *A'*)

Les unités *CC'* ont une autre fonction, celle de nommer les destinataires de cette miséricorde eschatologique. Le v.24 introduit ainsi les deux unités finales:

«nous qu'il a appelés

[a	= non seulement d'entre les juifs,
[b	= mais aussi d'entre les païens»,
[<i>B'</i>	= 25-26 appel des païens
[<i>A'</i>	= 27-29 appel des juifs = le Reste d'Israël

La plupart des exégètes tiennent pour assuré que *B'* parle de l'appel des païens et *A'* de l'Israël élu, le Reste, constitué par les judéo-chrétiens. Rares sont ceux qui appliquent *B'* à l'appel eschatologique d'Israël⁽¹⁸⁾. En faveur de cette dernière solution, il y a bien sûr Os 2,1.25 LXX qui est cité en Rm 9,25-26 et 27: se peut-il que l'apôtre utilise une prophétie qui parle manifestement d'Israël pour décrire l'appel des païens⁽¹⁹⁾? Aurait-il l'inconséquence d'appliquer

⁽¹⁸⁾ Voir en particulier BATTLE, «Paul's Use of the OT», qui interprète *B'* comme une annonce de la miséricorde finale à tout Israël et *A'* comme l'actuel appel du Reste, c'est-à-dire des chrétiens (judéo- et paganochrétiens). Voici quelques affirmations tirées de sa conclusion: «Yes Israel has been prepared by God to experience his mercy and share his glory, but this blessing will come only to those Israelites who respect and believe in him. For the present time only some believers, who, along with believing gentiles, will share in these blessings. But most of the nation is still in rebellion and under God's displeasure and judgment: their restoration as a nation is still in the future; as it says in Hosea... [suit Os 2,25 LXX cité en Rm 9,25]» (129). Le défaut majeur de cette interprétation est de parler de *révolte* alors que toute la section insiste sur le fait que la réponse humaine n'a rien à voir dans les choix divins. La solution proposée pour *B'* et *A'* va maintenant être discutée.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Dans la littérature juive de l'époque il ne semble pas y avoir d'autre représentant d'une telle exégèse.

Os 2,1b LXX aux païens en *B'* et Os 2,1a LXX à Israël en *A'*, alors que les deux parties du verset désignent les mêmes acteurs, le pronom *autois* d'Os 2,1b (cf Rm 9,26a) renvoyant sans confusion possible aux fils d'Israël mentionnés en Os 2,1a?

a) Les versets 25-26 et l'appel des païens

Malgré tout, plusieurs indices invitent à suivre les exégètes pour qui, en Rm 9,25-26, les citations d'Os 2,25b et 2,1 LXX expriment l'appel des païens. Notons en effet comment l'apôtre passe de *B'* à *A'*: en 9,25-26, le «vous» (*hymeis*) que Dieu va élire ou appeler n'est pas désigné; silence étonnant lorsqu'on considère le verset suivant où, au contraire, *Israel* est employé deux fois. Il faut donc aller chercher le référent du pronom *hymeis* juste au dessus, au v.24, où il s'agit des croyants, venus du judaïsme et du paganisme. Mais, dirait-on, s'il en est ainsi, les v.25-26 renvoient à tous les chrétiens sans exception, pas seulement les convertis du paganisme. Solution qui ne supprime en rien la difficulté de l'exégèse paulinienne: comment l'apôtre peut-il voir prophétisé l'appel des païens en un passage de l'Écriture où seuls les fils d'Israël sont pris en compte? Mais surtout, Rm 9,6-29 dans son ensemble interdit qu'on voie les judéo-chrétiens désignés en 25-26: dans ce chapitre, les choix de Dieu sont *définitifs* et l'apôtre n'envisage pas le cas d'une élection remise en question (les juifs devenant «pas mon peuple») pour être à nouveau entérinée. Les judéo-chrétiens du v.24 ne peuvent ainsi appartenir aux «pas-mon-peuple» du v.25, qui désignent les païens.

Remarquons également que le passage cité en Rm 9,27 est plus Is 10,22 qu'Os 2,1a. Dès lors, il ne s'agit pas d'expliquer une possible inversion entre Os 2,1a et 2,1b et leur application à deux acteurs différents, mais de savoir comment Paul en est venu à utiliser Os 2,1b pour l'appel des païens. Commençons donc par Rm 9,27-28. Le choix d'Is 10,22-23 permet 1) d'opposer l'ensemble d'Israël et le reste sauvé, et ainsi de faire inclusion avec l'unité *A*, où l'apôtre disait: «tous ceux qui sont de la postérité d'Israël ne sont pas Israël (v.6b); 2) de revenir (en Rm 9,28) sur la réalisation de la parole divine, autrement dit sur la *propositio* initiale (v.6a). Quant à l'exégèse de Paul en Rm 9,25-26, elle semble à première vue injustifiée, même si les commentateurs la disent libre et inspirée⁽²⁰⁾. En réalité, il semble

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. par exemple H. HÜBNER, *Gottes Ich und Israel* (FRLANT 136; Göttingen 1984) 127, qui se prononce ainsi sur l'ensemble de l'exégèse de

interpréter Os 2,1 et Is 10,22 l'un par l'autre, suivant en cela les principes de l'exégèse juive:

Os 2,1 *kai ēn*⁽²¹⁾ *ho arithmos tōn hyiōn Israēl hōs hē ammos tēs thalassēs, . . . , kai estai en tō topō. . .*

Is 10,22 *kai ean genētai ho laos Israēl hōs hē ammos tēs thalassēs, to hypoleimma autōn sōthēsetai.*

Si, comme le dit Is 10,22, le salut *futur* doit être celui du reste, alors Os 2,1b (cité par Rm 9,26) ne saurait renvoyer à tout Israël d'autant qu'Os 2,1a LXX parle des fils d'Israël *au passé*. Serait-il toutefois possible d'entendre Os 2,1b du reste? Non, car les prophètes ne parlent jamais d'un reste rejeté (qui deviendrait «pas non peuple» pour ensuite s'appeler de nouveau «mon peuple»). Os 2,1b (et, par voie de conséquence, Os 2,25 cité en Rm 9,25) ne pouvant ainsi désigner l'ensemble d'Israël ni le reste, va être appliqué à l'appel gracieux des païens. Mais ce faisant, l'apôtre justifie son propos du v.23 (Dieu a préparé, prévu. . .): la prophétie d'Osée explicite Ex 33,19 (cf. Rm 9,15) et souligne la cohérence de la parole divine — l'appel des païens ne vient ni d'un échec ni du hasard. Au demeurant, la citation d'Os 2,25 et 2,1 LXX en Rm 9,25-26 éclaire la progression de l'argumentation:

B = v.10-13 «j'ai aimé Jacob et j'ai haï Esau» (Ml 1,2-3)

. . .

B' = v.25-26 «celle qui n'était pas la bien-aimée
(je l'appellerai) bien-aimée» (Os 2,25)

Commençant par une série de distinctions et d'oppositions, l'apôtre en était arrivé à reprendre l'affirmation tranchée de Ml 1,2-3, qui avait déclenché l'objection sur l'injustice divine. En *AB* les oppositions semblaient définitives. Et voilà que la partie centrale *CC'* va permettre de les surmonter: le non-appel, le non-amour ne devaient pas durer et leur fonction (cf. v.17.22) pouvait ainsi être énoncée.

Paul en Rm 9-11: «Dass seine Hermeneutik ihn die Schrift so auslegen lässt, dass er in der Freiheit des Geistes die Freiheit zur geistmächtigen Änderung des Buchstabens der Schrift in Anspruch nimmt, ist offenkundig».

(21) Le *wḥāyāh* de l'hébreu exigeait évidemment un futur (*estai*).

b) La fonction des versets 27-29

La dernière unité A' (v.27-29) est interprétée diversement par les critiques. Selon certains, l'apôtre insisterait sur le non-salut de la majorité des fils d'Israël. Nous avons d'ailleurs noté ici-même la progression de la section au niveau de la non-élection:

$A = \text{v.6-9}$	tous ne sont pas enfants, fils de la promesse (aucune connotation négative)
$B = \text{v.10-13}$	non-élection accompagnée de sentiments négatifs (Esaü haï)
$C = \text{v.14-18}$	endurcissement
$C' = \text{v.19-24}$	perdition <i>future</i> mentionnée
$A' = \text{v.27-29}$	allusion à la destruction <i>déjà effectuée</i> (Sodome-Gomorrhe).

D'autres commentateurs pensent au contraire qu'en ces versets le sort d'Israël n'est pas vu d'abord à travers le rejet ou le déchet du grand nombre, mais en fonction du reste choisi et sauvé. Certains indices semblent appuyer cette dernière interprétation. En effet, les versets d'Isaïe choisis par Paul en Rm 9,27-29 ne disent *pas explicitement* que ceux qui ne font pas partie du reste ne verront pas le salut ni n'établissent l'homologie suivante,

$$\frac{\text{reste}}{\text{ensemble du peuple}} = \frac{\text{sauvé}}{\text{détruit}}$$

Mais, objectera-t-on, l'équivalence est implicite. Admettons-le provisoirement! Il importe cependant de rappeler que Rm 9,6b-29 vise à prouver la *propositio* de Rm 9,6a et qu'en finissant par une insistance sur le déchet, la section entière manquerait ce but. Nous avons d'ailleurs dit plus haut que Paul cite Is 10,23 (en Rm 9,28) pour souligner l'efficacité de la parole divine; sa fonction est de qualifier la fin du v.27 (*to hypoleimma sōthēsetai*), autrement dit, de souligner la réussite du plan divin⁽²²⁾.

Quant à Is 1,9 cité juste après, il finit certes avec l'allusion à la destruction de Sodome-Gomorrhe et appartient à un chapitre d'Isaïe

⁽²²⁾ Is 10,22b-23 TM parle de destruction (*kilyôn*). La connotation est donc nettement négative. Mais il n'en est pas de même pour la LXX qui remplace ce mot par *logon* (repris en Rm 9,28a) et aligne ainsi les versets 22b-23 sur le contexte (Is 10,20-21 et 10,24-27), essentiellement positif.

consacré au châtement du peuple infidèle, injuste et hypocrite, mais ici, en Rm 1,29, il ne garde pas cette connotation négative, parce que les deux villes n'ont jamais été considérées comme appartenant à Israël, ensuite parce que Dieu y est dans une relation positive avec le reste d'Israël et que le sort des villes ne lui est pas imputé. Comment ne pas voir également qu'en *A'* la descendance ou le reste⁽²³⁾ n'est plus seulement une promesse comme en *A* — même si, selon le v.29a, il s'agit encore d'une prophétie — mais une *expérience* faite par le reste lui-même (cf. le «ne nous avait laissé») et donc d'une réalisation et vérification de la continuité du dessein divin, qui a réussi à traverser les crises et les désastres:

<i>A</i> = v.6-9	promesse d'une descendance par Dieu
<i>A'</i> = v.27-29	expérience — par les descendants eux-mêmes — que Dieu a laissé une descendance.

Les v.27-29 n'insistent donc pas sur les nombreux fils d'Israël châtiés ou détruits, pas plus d'ailleurs que sur le reste élu ou sauvé, sinon pour déclarer que ce reste témoigne de la parole de Dieu, qui ne faiblit pas. Il n'y a surtout rien en *A'* sur le rejet d'Israël. On a même l'impression que Paul a choisi ces deux passages d'Isaïe parce qu'ils énoncent le salut du reste sans mentionner ni châtement ni un quelconque agir négatif de Dieu. J'y vois une preuve supplémentaire de la maîtrise de Paul en matière d'argumentation: il prépare ainsi les affirmations de Rm 11 sur le salut de *tout* Israël.

c) Le mouvement de l'argumentation

Les précédentes observations permettent encore d'interpréter la progression que nous avons constatée au niveau de la non-élection: en effet, si l'apôtre ne veut pas décrire péjorativement la non-élection, pourquoi, au fil des versets, sa terminologie devient-elle négative et ses allusions au châtement plus obvies? Nous avons vu qu'en réalité Paul a su choisir des passages bibliques où la distinction élu/non-élu était nette et les disposer en une progression *rhétorique*⁽²⁴⁾ qui tienne compte aussi de la dimension diachronique. En d'autres termes, tout au long de Rm 9 élection et non-élection restent

(23) Noter comment Is 1,9 (*egkatelipen sperma*) permet à Paul de montrer que la relation descendance-reste vient de l'Écriture elle-même.

(24) Les unités centrales *C* et *C'*, où la diatribe domine, constituent évidemment un indice décisif en faveur de cette interprétation.

liées comme les deux faces d'une médaille⁽²⁵⁾, mais plus on avance dans le chapitre, plus l'aspect miséricorde et salut, lié au reste, devient explicite et, au contraire, l'aspect châtiment-destruction implicite.

Nous avons vu que *B'* (v.25-26) ne pouvait valoir que pour les chrétiens venus du paganisme. Nous pouvons maintenant conclure qu'en *A'* (v.27-29) le reste désigne les judéo-chrétiens et pas seulement le reste d'Israël du temps d'Isaïe. En Rm 9,29 la formule qui introduit à Is 1,9 est en effet limpide («comme l'avait prédit Isaïe»): Paul ne fait pas d'abord du verset une constatation sur la permanence d'un reste au temps des rois, mais une prophétie de la situation des judéo-chrétiens. Le v.24 introduit donc bien les deux unités *B'* et *A'*.

4. L'appel des chrétiens

Nous avons déjà montré l'importance des unités *C* et *C'*, eu égard à la façon dont elles préparent la mention de l'appel des païens. Ce ne serait pourtant pas rendre justice à l'argumentation paulinienne que de s'en tenir à ces données, car depuis le tout début de la section l'apôtre préparait déjà, comme on va le voir, les affirmations des v.24-26.

Si l'on considère en effet les rapports existant entre Rm 8 et Rm 9, on ne peut qu'être frappé par la façon dont Paul décrit les chrétiens, les Israélites et Israël:

Rm 8 (dit des chrétiens d'origine juive et païenne)

<i>sarx / pneuma</i>	v.4	nous qui ne marchons pas selon la chair mais selon l'Esprit
	v.9	vous n'êtes pas <i>en sarki</i> mais <i>en pneumatikoi</i>
<i>hyioi, tekna</i>	v.14	sont fils de Dieu ceux qui sont conduits par l'Esprit de Dieu
	v.15	vous avez reçu un Esprit d' <i>hyiothesia</i>
	v.16.17.21	nous sommes enfants de Dieu...
<i>doxa</i>	v.17.18.21.30	nous aurons aussi part à sa gloire...
<i>kalein</i>	v.30	ceux qu'il a prédestinés, il les a aussi appelés

(25) Remarquons en passant combien Paul est un fin structuraliste avant la lettre: il ne traite pas les concepts sans leurs contraires et contradictoires.

Rm 9,4-5a (dit des israélites)

<i>hyiothesia</i>	}	v.4 à eux l' <i>hyiothesia</i> , la gloire... les promesses
<i>doxa</i>		
<i>epaggeliai</i>		
(<i>sarx</i>)		v.5a d'eux (vient) le Christ selon la chair

Rm 9,6-29

<i>sarx / epaggelia</i>	v.8 (ce ne sont) pas les enfants de la chair qui sont enfants de Dieu, mais les enfants de la promesse (+ v.9)					
<i>hyioi, tekna</i>	<table> <tr> <td rowspan="4">}</td> <td>v.7 tous ne sont pas enfants (+ v.8 ci-dessus)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>v.9 Sara aura un fils</td> </tr> <tr> <td>v.26 ils seront appelés fils du Dieu vivant</td> </tr> <tr> <td>v.27 le nombre des fils d'Israël</td> </tr> </table>	}	v.7 tous ne sont pas enfants (+ v.8 ci-dessus)	v.9 Sara aura un fils	v.26 ils seront appelés fils du Dieu vivant	v.27 le nombre des fils d'Israël
}	v.7 tous ne sont pas enfants (+ v.8 ci-dessus)					
	v.9 Sara aura un fils					
	v.26 ils seront appelés fils du Dieu vivant					
	v.27 le nombre des fils d'Israël					
<i>doxa</i>	v.23 vases de miséricorde que d'avance il avait préparés pour la gloire, nous...					
<i>kalein</i>	v.7.12.24.25.26					

Il serait sans aucun doute profitable de comparer les titres communs mais aussi différents donnés aux chrétiens en Rm 8 et aux israélites en Rm 9,4-5a⁽²⁶⁾. Toutefois, pour déterminer plus adéquatement le rôle de l'argumentation en Rm 9,6-29, il est plus intéressant de comparer les deux chapitres. Or, le relevé qui vient d'être fait montre un étonnant parallélisme entre Rm 8 et 9: on aura noté en chaque passage les distinctions répétées qui permettent d'exprimer progressivement le statut des enfants de Dieu ou de la promesse — distinctions au demeurant énoncées à l'aide des mêmes termes⁽²⁷⁾. En Rm 8, le

(26) Ce premier indice important de continuité entre Rm 8 et 9 suffirait déjà pour qu'on suspecte l'hypothèse de R. SCROGGS, «Paul as Rhetorician: Two Homilies in Romans 1-11», *Jews, Greeks and Christians* (FS. W.D. Davies; Leiden 1976) 271-298, qui, en se basant sur la répartition du vocabulaire et l'utilisation de l'Écriture, voit deux homélies différentes (Rm 1-4 + 9-11 et Rm 5-9) à l'origine du texte actuel de Rm 1-11. L'examen des expressions communes à Rm 8 et 9,6-29 confirme notre refus.

(27) L'opposition *sarx/pneuma* de Rm 8 devient *sarx/epaggelia* en Rm 9. L'absence du terme *pneuma* en Rm 9,6-29 et son remplacement par *epaggelia* s'explique aisément si l'on veut bien se rappeler 1) que cette section n'arrive à l'appel des chrétiens qu'à la fin (v.24) et qu'il n'est plus besoin de dire que leur statut vient du don de l'Esprit puisque cela a déjà été fait en Rm 8; 2) qu'en cette même section c'est la *parole* divine seule qui détermine tout (Dieu n'arrête pas de parler en ce chapitre) et ce, depuis le commencement, en étant promesse (*epaggelia*).

statut et l'agir des fils étaient déterminés par l'habitation de l'Esprit de Dieu, par Dieu donc et par lui seul; il en est de même en Rm 9, puisque la filiation divine y est uniquement produite par la parole, la promesse, le choix de Dieu, du début (patriarches) à la fin (appel des païens et salut du reste d'Israël). Et surtout, la reprise des mêmes distinctions indique bien que Paul prépare dans Rm 9,6-9 (=A) ce qu'il va dire sur l'appel des chrétiens (en particulier ceux venus du paganisme): si les enfants de Dieu sont ceux de la promesse, c'est-à-dire de la parole divine, et non ceux de la chair (v.8), alors même les païens pourront être appelés fils du Dieu vivant (v.26). On perçoit ainsi la fonction de Rm 9 par rapport au chapitre qui le précède: il insère dans le dessein éternel de Dieu les catégories utilisées par l'apôtre pour décrire les croyants et leur donne pour fondement la parole infaillible elle-même. De la sorte, Rm 9,6-29 ne prouve pas seulement que la parole divine a tenu ferme, puisqu'Israël n'a jamais été identique à la postérité (charnelle) d'Israël: la section enracine aussi l'expérience chrétienne de l'*hyiothesia*, décrite en Rm 8, dans le dessein éternel du Dieu plein de miséricorde.

Conclusion

Rm 9 est le premier volet d'un triptyque (Rm 9,6-29; 9,30-10,21; 11,1-36). Mais le mouvement de l'argumentation tout au long des trois chapitres a déjà fait l'objet de nombreuses études. Nous n'avons voulu ici que tracer de nouvelles pistes et montrer l'utilité de la structure concentrique de Rm 9 pour l'interprétation de plusieurs versets difficiles.

Cette structure permet de rendre compte de quelques bizarreries de vocabulaire (l'absence du verbe *kalein* aux v.14-23) que le modèle midrashique n'explique pas. Elle met également en relief la pointe théologique du passage — surtout la miséricorde.

Il nous a semblé également capital de signaler les relations — jusqu'à présent ignorées — de type lexicographique et logique existant entre Rm 8 et 9: il en va de l'unité de l'épître et du lien de l'expérience et du statut chrétiens (décrits en Rm 8) avec le dessein éternel de Dieu.

SUMMARY

The Pauline argumentation in Rom 9 follows several models at the same time (concentric, midrashic, rhetorical). This article presents the concentric model, which has not yet been pointed out. The concentric composition of Rom 9,6-29 confirms this interpretation: the determination of the extension of the passage, of its logic and main point, of the reciprocal function of the statements concerning mercy and hardening... The study concludes by showing the role of Rom 9 in relation to Rom 8, which has not been noticed until now.

Das "Rebhuhn" von Jeremia 17,11. Erwägungen zu einem prophetischen Gleichnis

I

qōrē', eigentlich "Schreier, Rufer" (von *qr'* I), wird im Alten Testament ein Vogel bezeichnet, den man gewöhnlich mit dem Rebhuhn⁽¹⁾, zutreffender wohl mit dem Steinhuhn⁽²⁾ identifiziert. Seine auffallendste Eigenschaft, der hohe und laute Ruf, mit dem er seine Küken leitet, hat ihm seinen hebräischen Namen eingebracht⁽³⁾. Noch der Septuaginta-Übersetzer mochte sich nicht entscheiden, ob das ihm in Jer 17,11 vorliegende *qr'* als Vogelbezeichnung (πέρδιξ) oder als Verbalform (ἐφώνησεν) oder als beides wiederzugeben sei und entschied sich vorsichtig für die dritte Möglichkeit: "es rief ein Steinhuhn". 1 Sam 26,20 — die zweite alttestamentliche Stelle, wo die Bezeichnung vorkommt — spielt auf die guten Lauf-, aber schlechten Flugeigenschaften des Vogels an. Sie sind der Grund, weswegen er durch Hetzen und Treiben (*rdp*) gejagt und mit Stöcken erschlagen werden kann. David vergleicht die Verfolgung durch Saul

⁽¹⁾ HALAT, 1056 (dort die ältere Literatur). Besonders zu erwähnen ist J. F. A. SAWYER, "A Note on the Brooding Partridge in Jeremiah xvii 11", VT 28 (1978) 324-329. Dort sind vor allem die antiken Zeugnisse zusammengestellt.

⁽²⁾ O. KEEL (u.a.), *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel*, Bd. 1 (Göttingen 1984) 159 (Abb. 85): "Es handelt sich dabei meist um die ö Spielart unseres Steinhuhns, das Chukarsteinhuhn (85; *Alectoris graeca chukar* Gray)". Vgl. *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (Leicester 1980) I 63. Das Verhältnis zu dem *gūnī* bezeichneten Vogel ("schwarzflügeliges Rebhuhn", vgl. HALAT, 176) ist unklar. Auch scheint es mir nicht sicher, ob man eine Differenzierung in Steinhuhn (Jer 17,11) und Sandhuhn (1 Sam 26,20) vornehmen kann, wie in: *Fauna and Flora of the Bible* (London-New York-Stuttgart ²1980 [1972]) 64f., vorgeschlagen wird.

⁽³⁾ Vgl. die Bezeichnung Reb-Huhn < Röp-Huhn (röpen = rufen). "Tschuck tschuck tschu tschuck tschukor", dem oft ein 'kakaba kakaba' folgt" (KEEL, *Orte und Landschaften*, 159).

mit einer solchen Jagd: "wie man verfolgt das Steinhuhn⁽⁴⁾ in den Bergen". Andere Eigenschaften⁽⁵⁾, erkennbare oder vermeintliche, wurden schon in der Antike diesem Vogel nachgesagt, wobei sein Ruf nicht zuletzt unter dem Einfluß von Jer 17,11, vielmehr durch das, was man für den Sinn dieses Verses hielt, beträchtlich gelitten hat⁽⁶⁾.

Das Sprichwort⁽⁷⁾, auf das Jer 17,11a α zurückzugehen scheint – und das seinerseits aus dem "Volks glauben" abzuleiten ist –, bezieht sich auf das Brutverhalten dieses Vogels. Von den, vor allem auf Jes 34,15 basierenden vier Stufen des "breeding cycle", bestehend aus *qnn* 'nisten', *hmljt* 'Eier legen', *dgr* 'brüten' und *bq* 'ausbrüten, Schlüpfen lassen' die J. F. A. Sawyer herausgearbeitet hat⁽⁸⁾, sind hier zwei genannt: einmal *dgr* 'brüten'⁽⁹⁾ und dann *jld* 'gebären'. Letzteres bezieht Sawyer aus grammatischen Gründen auf den ganzen Vorgang "producing young", not "laying eggs". Er ist der Meinung, *jld* "er (es) hat geboren" könne sich nach der *consecutio temporum*, nach Satzkoordination und Genusgebrauch nur auf eine Handlungsfolge beziehen, weshalb mit der allgemeineren zweiten Verbalform nur der sonst mit *bq* ausgedrückte Vorgang des Ausbrütens und Ausschlüpfens gemeint sein könne. Indes sind die Gründe nicht unbedingt triftig, weil nämlich gegen die nächstliegende Annahme, daß die zweite Verbalform vorzeitige Bedeutung hat⁽¹⁰⁾, nichts, vielmehr alles dafür spricht, daß *jld* sich trotz Jer 30,6 auf die maskuline Form *qōrē* bezieht und die übliche und allgemeine Bedeutung 'gebären' und auch: 'Eier legen' hat⁽¹¹⁾.

(4) LXX: νυκτικόραξ 'Nachtrabe' für *qōrē*.

(5) Nach Sir 11,30 dient das Steinhuhn in einem Käfigkorb als Köder bei der Jagd.

(6) Vgl. auch J. FELIKS, "Rebhuhn", BHHWB III 1558f.

(7) Vgl. dazu T. R. HOBBS, "Some Proverbial Reflections in the Book of Jeremiah", ZAW 91 (1979) 62-72. Er erkennt in Jer 17,11 "a quotation from popular proverbial sentiment" (67) und rechnet den Spruch der Gattung des "proverbial simile" (sprichwörtliches Gleichnis) zu (62f.).

(8) A.a.O., 325f.

(9) Vgl. Kimchis Erklärung: *rbš 'l-bšjm wmḥmm 'tm*. Dazu SAWYER, "A Note on the Brooding Partridge", 325; HALAT, 205.

(10) Perfekt in untergeordneter syntaktischer Beziehung.

(11) Die rhetorische Frage von Jer 30,6: *'îm-jōlēd zākār* gilt prinzipiell auch für Vögel. Doch ob man speziell beim *qōrē* zwischen sprachlich m. und f. einen Unterschied gemacht hat, bleibt ungewiß.

"Das Steinhuhn brütet⁽¹²⁾, was (wo) es nicht gelegt", meint sehr wahrscheinlich das in menschlichen Augen teils leichtsinnige, teils übereifrig ängstliche Verhalten dieses Vogels, der sein Gelege offenbar in flachen Mulden im Sand hat — oft ziemlich ungeschützt auch neben begangenen Wegen — und seiner zahlreichen Feinde wegen viele Eier brüten muß, um Nachwuchs zu erhalten. Dabei ist es bemerkenswert, daß das Männchen beim Brüten hilft. Es wurde beobachtet, daß — wenn die Nester nah beieinander sind — gelegentlich Verwechslungen beim zeitweiligen oder erzwungenen endgültigen Verlassen der Brutstätte vorkommen können. Alle diese Eigenheiten faßt offenbar das Sprichwort zusammen, das in bündiger Diktion das Verhalten des Vogels charakterisieren und wohl auch kritisieren will. Das poetische Gepräge des Doppelzweiers ist durch alliterative Merkmale bestimmt. So entsprechen sich *qr* und *gr* sowie *wl* und *jl*⁽¹³⁾.

II

Auch Jer 17,11 soll das Steinhuhn-Motiv offensichtlich dem Vergleich dienen. "Empfänger" im Vergleich oder die Bezugsgröße, die das Sprichwort beleuchten soll, ist derjenige Mensch, der "Reichtum macht, doch nicht mit Recht". Die singuläre Wendung *'śh 'śr* nimmt nicht ungeschickt die syntaktische Struktur des Bildworts und das Formprinzip der Silbenwiederholung (*'ś 'ś*) auf, so daß zwei genau parallele Sequenzen entstehen und Sach- und Bildhälfte sich symmetrisch gegenüber stehen. Dieser Gleichförmigkeit indessen entspricht die inhaltliche Beziehung der beiden Teile in keiner Weise.

Die Wendung *'śh 'śr* mag dem modernen Geschäftssinn entgegenkommen ("make money")⁽¹⁴⁾, im hebräischen Umfeld war sie zumindest ungewöhnlich. Mag man diese noch auf den Formzwang der vorgegebenen Alliteration zurückführen, so hat dies in der zweiten Hälfte zu dem etwas pauschalen Ausdruck "und nicht mit

⁽¹²⁾ An sich wäre in einem Sprichwort ein Partizip *dōgēr* zu erwarten.

⁽¹³⁾ Dies ist typisch für Jeremias poetischen Stil, vgl. meine Studie: "Der 'Löwe' von Jeremia XII 8. Bemerkungen zu einem prophetischen Gedicht", VT 36 (1986) 93-104.

⁽¹⁴⁾ BDB 799.

Recht" geführt, wodurch der Reichtum dieses Reichen als unrechtmäßig erworben bezeichnet werden soll.

Für sich genommen bildet die Sachparallele keine Satzeinheit wie das Sprichwort der ersten Hälfte. Sie bietet vielmehr — nach dem Strukturmuster des Sprichworts betrachtet — nur ein erweitertes Subjekt: "der Reichtum macht, doch nicht mit Recht, der...". Die genauere Beziehung zum Vorhergehenden muß aus dem Sinnzusammenhang erschlossen werden.

Die Frage nach dem *tertium comparationis* zwischen den beiden Verschälften hat die Ausleger seit eh und je beschäftigt. Dabei ist die Tendenz festzustellen, von dem vermeintlich klaren Sachverhalt unrechtmäßig beschafften Reichtums her die Bildhälfte zu erhellen — gegenläufig zur Funktion des Gleichnisses, das ja seinerseits erhellen soll. So kam es auch, daß dem Reb- bzw. Steinhuhn unlautere Machenschaften unterstellt wurden, indem ihm — dem Reichen gleich — das "Organisieren" und "Aufhäufen" von Eiern aus fremden Gelegen zur Last gelegt wurde mit dem "Schein des Rechts", begründet mit einer spätaramäischen Bedeutungsentwicklung von *dgr* zu 'aufhäufen', 'sammeln' ⁽¹⁵⁾, kräftig unterstützt durch die Septuaginta-Wiedergabe συνήγαγεν, deren Herkunft jedoch in Sachüberlegungen zu sehen ist. Doch die Frage drängt sich auf: Kann das Verhalten des Huhns beim Brüten der nicht nur eigenen, aber wohl vermeintlich eigenen Eier das Gebaren des Reichen erhellen oder erklären oder illustrieren? Oder liegt die Schwierigkeit darin, daß dem Ausleger der selbstverständliche Horizont des Sprichworts vom Steinhuhn und seiner Welt verloren gegangen ist, sodaß er nun umgekehrt von der Geschäftswelt und ihrer (Un-)Moral her — die ihm offenbar vertrauter ist — das Verhalten des Vogels erklären muß? Der Vergleich in der hebräischen Fassung bleibt jedenfalls diffus.

III

V.11b macht nun ein neues Angebot, das darin besteht, das *tertium comparationis* nicht im Brüten fremder Eier, sondern im erzwungenen Verlassen und Aufgeben des Nestes "in der Hälfte seiner Tage" zu erkennen. Wie das Huhn sein Gelege preisgeben muß, so

⁽¹⁵⁾ HALAT, 205: targumisch und mandäisch.

muß der Reiche seinen unrechtmäßig erworbenen Reichtum vorzeitig verlassen; oder — zweite Möglichkeit — er, der Reichtum, verläßt ihn wie die fremde Brut die Vogelmutter (so glaubt man)⁽¹⁶⁾. Und bei solchem vorzeitigem Ende des Reichtums oder dem vorzeitigen Tod des Reichen wird er als Tor (*nābāl*) oder Taugenichts gelten. Für sich genommen klingt beides eigentlich unter bestimmten Voraussetzungen plausibel, so daß man sich zunächst überlegen könnte, ob nicht V.11bα: "in der Mitte seiner Tage wird er es verlassen" noch zur Bildhälfte, und damit zum Steinhuhn-Logion zu ziehen wäre, wofür auch einige poetische Stilzüge — nur in V.11bα, nicht in V.11bβ — sprechen könnten⁽¹⁷⁾.

Dann freilich wird es unumgänglich, was sich schon als Möglichkeit abgezeichnet hat, nämlich die Aussage vom Reichen von dem Steinhuhnwort so zu trennen, daß V.11aα und V.11bα sowie V.11aβ und V.11bβ zusammenbleiben, d.h. es wäre eine senkrechte Trennungslinie oder eine Umstellung der Halbverse vorzunehmen:

"Das Steinhuhn brütet,
wo es nicht gelegt,
in der Hälfte seiner Tage
wird es verlassen."

"Der sich Reichtum schafft,
doch nicht mit Recht,
(und) an seinem Ende
wird er ein Tor sein."

Diese Lösung hat den Nachteil (außer der chiastischen Umstellung), daß das Gleichniswort an Struktur verliert, sowohl, was die formale Gestaltung angeht — das Bezugswort für "es" fehlt; im zweiten Teil herrscht prosaische Diktion vor —, als auch, was die inhaltliche Seite angeht. Denn zwischen dem Brüten fremder Eier und dem vorzeitigen Verlassen des Nestes ist der Zusammenhang ohne Verwendung moralischer Kategorien wenig einsichtig. Sollte dem Beobachter, der 17,11a formulieren konnte, entgangen sein, daß der Vorgang in der Natur sich eher in umgekehrter Folge abspielt, und das Huhn eben deswegen fremde Eier ausbrütet, weil es die eigenen aufgeben mußte?

⁽¹⁶⁾ In den Auslegungen liest man häufig, daß "dem brütenden Vogel die fremden Jungen entschlüpfen" (so etwa P. VOLZ, *Der Prophet Jeremia*, [KAT X; 1922; 1928] 185. Mag sein, daß man den Satz so übersetzen kann und daß der Volksglaube das angenommen hat. Doch ist das Verlassen einer "falschen Mutter" keineswegs eine natürliche Folge.

⁽¹⁷⁾ *hšj* — *j'z* in alliterativer Silbenumkehrung, vgl. Anm. 13.

Auf der andern Seite hinkt der Vergleich zwischen dem Verlassen des Geleges — vom Vogel oder von der Brut gesagt — und dem vorzeitigen Tod des Reichen in ähnlicher Weise wie beim Motiv des Brütens! Wie man es auch dreht und wendet, man hat einige Mühe mit dem durch die Umstellung gewonnenen, doppelzeiligen, also ungewöhnlich langen Maschal, so daß es sich doch nahelegt, noch andere Lösungsmöglichkeiten zu erwägen.

Eine derartige Möglichkeit ergibt sich, wenn man die angedeutete Spur weiter verfolgt und in dem Parallelglied in V.11aß den Anfang eines sich bis zum Ende von V.11b erstreckenden Zusatzes sieht, der in Angleichung und Anlehnung an das Steinhuhnwort und unter Verwendung assoziativer Vorstellungen aus dem Steinhuhnmotiv eine lehrhafte Aussage über das Geschick des Neureichen zu formulieren sucht und insofern Auslegungscharakter hat.

Schon das Formmuster des Steinhuhnwortes war für diese Formulierungen verpflichtend; sie scheinen vorgegebenes Vorbild zu sein. Die vage Aussage vom Reichtum ohne Recht sodann basiert auf weisheitlich-moralischen Kategorien wie auch die These, daß der Ungerechte in der Hälfte seiner Tage davon muß. Daß "unrecht Gut" nicht "gedeihet", mag als Erfahrungswert etwas für sich haben; daß der unrechtmäßig zu Reichtum Gekommene "in der Hälfte seiner Tage (den Reichtum) verlassen muß" und daß er "an seinem Ende" als Tor gelten muß, entspricht einer Rechnung, die auf Wunschdenken beruht — wobei die Formel "in der Mitte seiner Tage" den vorzeitigen Tod meint (Ps 102,24); daß aber diese Logik Stütze oder Beweis oder Illustration durch das Steinhuhnvergleichnis erfährt, ist nur dann denkbar, wenn das ganze Verhalten und Ergehen des Tiers der synthetischen Lebensbetrachtung unterworfen und daraus ein "Naturgesetz" abgeleitet wird. Solch ausgreifendes Suchen nach Analogien im Lebenszusammenhang ist am besten durch die Annahme zu erklären, daß primär der Steinhuhn-Maschal 17, 11aα vorlag und als solcher Rätsel aufgab. Einem redigierenden, von weisheitlichem Denken eingenommenen Ausleger wurde das Gleichnis zur Allegorie, die möglichen *tertia comparationis* zu Motivanalogien. Doch offensichtlich ging nicht alles auf. Im übrigen geht dann die Mißdeutung des Brütens als Raffes von Reichtümern und die Diskriminierung des Steinhuhns zu einem Teil auch auf sein Konto und nicht bloß auf das des Septuaginta-Übersetzers.

Die Frage ist, was von 17,11 auf Jeremia selbst zurückzuführen ist. Für 17,11aα, das Bildwort also, möchte man — unbeschadet sei-

ner Vorgeschichte als Sprichwort und seiner Bestimmung zum JHWH-Wort — das annehmen. Für die sapientiale Auslegung und didaktische Verwertung des Gleichnisses in 17,11aß.b bleiben da doch erhebliche Zweifel. Sollte Jeremia seine eigenen Logien so vage interpretiert haben⁽¹⁸⁾?

Soweit ich sehe, gibt es also drei Lösungen:

1. 17,11aß bildet einen Parallelismus mit 17,11aα, ist aber später überkleistert und durch 17,11b ergänzt worden.
2. 17,11aα.11ba bildeten ein Logion, das mit einem Lehrsatz chiasmisch kombiniert worden ist.
3. 17,11aα ist in 17,11aß.b fortgeschrieben, verarbeitet und sukzessive erläutert worden.

Die Wahrscheinlichkeit nimmt in der angegebenen Reihenfolge zu. Aber es drängt sich dann wieder die Frage nach Sinn und Funktion des aus seinem Zusammenhang gelösten Steinhuhn-Logions in den Vordergrund.

IV

"17₁₁ ist wieder ein Maschal, von dem man nicht weiss, was es im B. Jeremia soll" — schreibt B. Duhm⁽¹⁹⁾ und: "Cap. 17 ist eine seltsame Sammlung von Gedichten, Sprüchen und Reden, von denen Jeremia das Wenigste angehört...".

Löst man das Steinhuhn-Logion aus seiner weisheitlich-didaktischen Umrahmung — wie es oben versucht wurde —, stellt sich die Duhmsche Frage neu. Seines unmittelbaren Kontextbezugs beraubt, wird es umso dringender, nach dem Zusammenhang Ausschau zu halten, der dem Sprichwort als solchem die ihm nunmehr fehlende Resonanz verleiht.

⁽¹⁸⁾ P. Volz nennt V.11b ein "Dogma der Weisheitsschule". Er hält es zwar für denkbar, daß der Prophet 17,5ff. eine Reihe "Maschäls in stillen Stunden niedergeschrieben" hat, jedoch für wahrscheinlicher, "daß ein begabter *Weisheitslehrer*, der sich an Jer gebildet hat, diese schönen Sprüche verfaßte" (184f.). Im Blick auf die hier zutagetretende rationalistische und moralistische Denkweise könnte man solche weisheitlichen Bearbeitungen dem Spektrum C der dtr Schicht im Jeremia-Buch im weiteren Sinne zuschreiben.

⁽¹⁹⁾ *Das Buch Jeremia* (KHC XI) Zitate 147, bzw. 142.

17,11 steht nun überlieferungsgeschichtlich in jener "seltsamen Sammlung", von der immerhin die redaktionelle Überschrift in 17,5 sagt, daß es sich um eine Reihe von JHWH-Worten handelt, was durch die Ich-Formulierungen in den Sprucheinheiten selbst da und dort bestätigt wird⁽²⁰⁾. Unter dieser Voraussetzung haben diese Logien insgesamt und speziell 17,11aα eine ganz andere Funktion. Es geht nun nicht um eine Illustration des ohnehin Klaren und Selbstverständlichen; vielmehr geht es um etwas ganz und gar nicht Selbstverständliches, um etwas, das erst durch ein Gleichnis ans Tageslicht gezogen und transparent gemacht wird, und d.h. wahrscheinlich eben nicht um einen aufweisbaren Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang.

Da das Logion durch Jeremia übermittelt wurde, liegt es nicht ganz fern anzunehmen, es habe ursprünglich dem Propheten selbst gegolten. Dafür spricht zuerst, daß es unvermittelt und beziehungslos einsetzt und den Orientierungspunkt nicht erkennen läßt, auf den es zielt. Er muß demnach in der vorgegebenen Situation liegen⁽²¹⁾. Dafür spricht auch, daß das Gleichnis in der Kurzfassung außerordentlich knapp ist, also beim Adressaten ein vorgegebenes Verständnis voraussetzt, was am ehesten beim Propheten selbst und seinem aktuellen Problembewußtsein zuzutreffen scheint. Dafür spricht weiter, daß das Vergleichstier im maskulinen Singular erscheint, obgleich der angedeutete Vorgang, zumindest des "Gebärens" oder "Eier Legens", trotz der beobachteten Bruthilfe des Männchens, als typisch weiblich gelten muß. Schließlich spricht dafür, daß zwischen der Bezeichnung des Wüstensteinhuhns mit *qōrē* 'Rufer' und der prophetischen Tä-

⁽²⁰⁾ In der LXX-Fassung fehlt 17,1-4 und die Einleitungsformel in V.5a. Da aber 16,21 und 17,10 dort als JHWH-Rede formuliert sind, ist zu vermuten, daß der Zwischentext als von gleicher Herkunft galt. 1.P. 17,10.13b; 3.P. JHWH allerdings findet sich auch 17,5b.7.13a (2.P.) 13b (*add.*?), mit einiger Wahrscheinlichkeit jedoch nur in sekundären Passagen (17,5b.7.13a).

L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL versucht wie andere vor ihm, 17,5-13 als eine literarische und theologische Einheit zu begreifen, in der 17,11 als Beispiel für falsches Vertrauen erscheint. Die sonst übliche Antithese bei den Reichtum-Sprüchen ersetzt hier der Kontext. "Tú eres la esperanza de Israel" (Jer 17,5-13), *Künder des Wortes* (FS. J. Schreiner) (Würzburg 1982) 95-104. Vgl. auch u. Anm. 45.

⁽²¹⁾ Vgl. J. M. BERRIDGE, *Prophet, People, and the Word of Yahweh* (Diss. Basel 1967 [BST 4 (1970)] 137f.; T. R. HOBBS, "Some Proverbial Reflections", 67ff.

tigkeit der Verkündigung (*qr'*)⁽²²⁾ sich ein unmittelbarer Zusammenhang ergibt, der sehr wohl eine Anwendung des Maschals auf den Propheten selbst tragen könnte. Man darf wohl sagen, daß alle diese Hinweise in eine bestimmte Richtung deuten und daß es darum als wahrscheinlich gelten kann, daß dieses Wort mit Jeremia selbst zu tun hat.

Was wäre in diesem Falle das *tertium comparationis*? Im Blick auf das Verhalten des Vogels wird man zunächst sagen: ein gewisser Übereifer vielleicht oder auch angstvolle Hektik, möglicherweise durch Bedrohungen verursacht. Dann wäre dem Sinne nach das Logion etwa so zu ergänzen und auszurichten:

"Der 'Rufer' brütet, wo er nicht gelegt —

Der 'Künder' kümmert sich um Dinge, die ihn nichts angehen".

Wenn das richtig wäre⁽²³⁾, ergäbe sich ein Gotteswort an Jeremia von — wenn man so sagen darf — überlegenem Humor. Der Vergleich im Wortspiel⁽²⁴⁾ von *qr'* zwischen dem Rufen des Huhns und dem Verkündigen des Propheten wäre für den Betroffenen unmittelbar klar und einsichtig. Denn auch er ruft, klagt, warnt, schimpft und singt, wie es das Huhn mit seinen Küken tut. Der Vergleich mit dem Brüten fremder Eier aber enthält offensichtlich einen Tadel, wegen des allzu ängstlichen Eifers, sich "wie ein blindes Huhn" auch um Dinge anderer zu kümmern, die nicht seines Amtes sind. Zu monieren wäre also eine gewisse Kompetenzüberschreitung, die der Prophet — wiewohl in bester Absicht — begangen haben soll. Es

⁽²²⁾ *qr'* sonst vor allem als redaktionelle Bezeichnung von Jeremias prophetischer Tätigkeit verwendet, etwa 2,2;3,12;7,2;11,6; 19,6. Vgl. dazu C. J. LABUSCHAGNE, "*qr'*, rufen", *THAT* II 669: *qr'* als *terminus technicus* des prophetischen Auftrags.

⁽²³⁾ Nach der im Unterricht beheimateten Gleichnisform der Gegenüberstellung von Bild- und Sachhälfte (Hobbs: "simile") in genauer formaler Entsprechung — z.B. Prv 11,22:

"Ein goldener Ring am Rüssel eines Schweins —
eine schöne Frau ohne Sitte".

Auch Jer 17,11, das Gleichnis vom Reichen, ist aus dem Zwang entstanden, der Bild- die Sachhälfte hinzuzufügen und das Sprichwort zum Gleichniswort zu ergänzen.

⁽²⁴⁾ Daß Jeremia solche Wortspiele nicht fremd sind, zeigt beispielhaft 1,11 (*šqd* — Wacholder / wachen o.ä.).

bleibt die Frage, ob sich noch erkennen läßt, worin diese Grenzüberschreitung bestanden haben könnte.

Bleibt man eng beim Vogelgleichnis, wo die Grenzüberschreitung die von anderen Vögeln, also Reb- ("Ruf-") und Steinhühnern gelegten Eier betrifft, legt sich der Gedanke nahe, der prophetische Übergriff beziehe sich auch auf das "Gelege" anderer seinesgleichen, und das wären dann wohl andere Propheten.

Nun ist durch die Überlieferung des Jeremia-Buches klar und deutlich, daß Jeremia in einem spannungsvollen Verhältnis zu den *nēbi'im*⁽²⁵⁾ seiner Tage stand, denen er in persönlichen Auseinandersetzungen auch Worte zu sagen hatte, die nunmehr in 23,9ff. gesammelt vorliegen. Unter diesen ragt seiner Gleichnisgestalt⁽²⁶⁾ wegen das Logion in 23,28 besonders heraus, weil es das Verhältnis Jeremias zu den Mantikern und Traumdeutern beleuchtet:

"Was hat das Stroh mit dem Korn gemein, Spruch JHWHs".

Dabei bezieht sich das "Korn" auf den Wort-Propheten, das "Stroh" auf die Traum-Propheten. Beide stehen in einer Wert-Relation. Der Traum wird als Offenbarungsmittel von Jeremia auch keineswegs abgelehnt (23,28 Grundtext)⁽²⁷⁾, jedoch abgewertet. Könnte die durch Stroh und Korn angedeutete Beziehung nicht dieselbe sein, die auch durch das Bildwort von den Rebhühnern wiedergegeben ist? Oder dürfte man noch weiter gehen und fragen, ob der Anlaß zu solcher im Gleichnis ergehenden Auskunft wie bei dem Stroh-Korn-

⁽²⁵⁾ Die Frage, ob Jeremia sich selbst als *nābī'* gesehen oder bezeichnet hat (vgl. dazu 1,4ff.) ist unabhängig von der Frage nach den Auseinandersetzungen mit den *nēbi'im*, wie sie etwa in Jer 26–29 berichtet werden. Vgl. z.B. einen Satz wie: "Da sprach Jeremia der Prophet zu Hananja dem Propheten..." (29,5). Zum Problem F. L. HOSSFELD–I. MEYER, *Prophet gegen Prophet* (BB 9; Fribourg 1973); G. MÜNDERLEIN, *Kriterien wahrer und falscher Prophetie. Entstehung und Bedeutung im AT* (Bern–Frankfurt 1974 [1979]).

⁽²⁶⁾ Rhetorische Frage wie z.B. 12,5; 15,12; 2+2 Akzente, 6+5 Konsonanten (17,11 a 6+6). Vgl. hierzu W. BRUEGGEMANN, "Jeremiah's Use of Rhetorical Questions", *JBL* 92 (1973) 358–374. Die Gottesspruchformel zeigt wie überall in Jer 1–25 ein prophetisches Logion an.

⁽²⁷⁾ Die häufig gesetzte Spruchformel weist auf die Komplexität des überlieferten Textes hin. Als Grundtext ist etwa anzusehen: 23,23. 24.25 a.α.b.27 a*.28.29. Ähnlich J. SCHREINER, *Jeremia 1–25,14*, (NEB; Würzburg 1981) 136ff.

Wort nicht ebenfalls ein Beziehungsproblem der "Propheten" untereinander war?

V

Es fällt auf, daß der innerste Kern der prophetischen Klage⁽²⁸⁾ in Jer 17,14-18 die Auseinandersetzung mit Worten ist, die sehr wahrscheinlich von anderen Propheten stammen. Es geht um den Passus 17,15.16a, offenbar einem Zweizeiler, der seiner außerordentlichen Härte wegen eher den jeremianischen Klagen als den Konfessionen entspricht und jedenfalls aus seinem psalmischen Kontext zu lösen ist⁽²⁹⁾. Einer präzisen Erfassung standen bisher die großen textlichen Schwierigkeiten, vor allem von V.16 entgegen. Immerhin ist so viel deutlich, daß der Prophet sich — unabhängig von den Aussagen des psalmischen Kontextes — davon distanziert, sich selbst in einer Weise gedrängt zu haben⁽³⁰⁾, die er nach dem zunächst ganz unverständlichen Ausdruck *mr'h* mit *'ah^arêkâ* "hinter dich", "hinter dir", "in dein Gefolge", "in deiner Gefolgschaft" bezeichnet. Wenn er sich

⁽²⁸⁾ Zur neueren Literatur über die sog. Konfessionen vgl. W. THIEL, "Ein Vierteljahrhundert Jeremia-Forschung", *VF* 31 (1986) 32-52. Im Prinzip halte ich die Analysen (z.B. von F. D. HUBMANN, *Untersuchungen zu den Konfessionen Jer 11,18-126 und Jer 15,10-21* [FzB 30; Würzburg 1978]; DERS., "Die 'Konfessionen' Jeremias — eine Gesamtschau", *TPQ* 132 [1984] 25-39 u.a.) für richtig, welche die prophetische Klage in poetischem Stil von der psalmähnlichen Konfession im nachexilischen Gebetsstil (nach dem Muster des Klagelieds des Einzelnen) unterscheiden. Die so gewonnenen Zwei- bis Vierzeiler bilden m.E. den Kern der redaktionell stark erweiterten Texte. Zur Gesamtdeutung vgl. auch H. MOTTU, *Les 'Confessions' de Jérémie. Une protestation contre la souffrance* (Le Monde de la Bible; Genève 1985).

⁽²⁹⁾ Eine Analyse würde hier zu weit führen. Wir beschränken uns auf einige Hinweise hinsichtlich des Kerns, den wir in 17,15.16a etwa sehen. V.14.16b.17-18 entsprechen nach Stil und Inhalt dem individuellen Klagepsalm. Sie gehören zur redaktionellen Weiterung. Nur V.15.16a läßt konkrete Hinweise auf eine bestimmte Situation erkennen, während V.14 (Krankheit, Not), V.17f. (Verfolgung) eine Typisierung vorzuliegen scheint. Nach den eindeutigeren Parallelen wie 4,19f.; 8,18ff.; 11,18+12,6; 15,10; 15,17f. bestanden die jeremianischen Klagen zumeist aus wenigen Verszeilen von charakteristischer Prägung. 17,15.16a würde diesem Strukturmuster entsprechen.

⁽³⁰⁾ **wš* (zu unterscheiden wohl von **jš* 'kurz, gering sein') = **šš* (vgl. **šwtj* 4QJer*) 'hastig, hurtig sein/tun', 'drängen', 'hasten' (HALAT, 23). Wahrscheinlich ein Hinweis auf die mangelnde Legitimation durch eine Berufung ("Ich habe diese Propheten nicht gesandt, und doch laufen sie", 23,21).

von einer solchen Haltung des hastigen Drängens aber distanziert, muß sie ihm als Möglichkeit oder Wirklichkeit vor Augen gestanden haben. Da er zuvor die Worte, die "sie" sagen, zitiert, nämlich: "Wo ist das Wort JHWHs? Es komme doch!", und danach sie mit dem Satz erläutert, sie hätten den "unheilbaren⁽³¹⁾ Tag herbeigewünscht", wird er mit alledem wohl die Haltung derer charakterisieren, die seinem Wort keinen Glauben schenken, es vielmehr als echtes Wort JHWHs in Zweifel ziehen. Man versteht diese Gegenposition am besten, wenn man nicht bloß an ungläubige Hörer irgendwelcher Art denkt, sondern speziell an die Experten, oder vermeintlichen Experten, des "Wortes JHWHs", welche im Gegensatz zu Jeremia ausschließlich Heil verkündigen zu müssen meinten und welche nun aus dem Ausbleiben des von Jeremia verkündigten Unheils Wasser auf ihre Mühlen zu leiten versuchen, sehr zum Kummer Jeremias, der sich dadurch in doppelter Weise bedrängt fühlen muß: von JHWH in der verzögerten Erfüllung im Stich gelassen und von den Heilspropheten wegen derselben Verzögerung verhöhnt⁽³²⁾. Er selbst indes klagt, daß er es nicht wagt, auf Erfüllung zu drängen und das Unheil herbeizuwünschen.

So verstanden könnte vielleicht auch auf den unverständlichen Ausdruck *mr'h* in V.16 etwas Licht fallen. Entgegen den traditionellen Deutungsversuchen⁽³³⁾ wäre er wohl am besten von *r'h* II 'sich verbinden', 'sich vereinen' abzuleiten und im Kern als *terminus technicus* (?) 'Genossenschaft', 'Gemeinschaft', 'Kollegium' o.ä.⁽³⁴⁾ zu verstehen etwa in dem Sinne von: "Ich aber habe mich nicht — anders als die Genossenschaft (der *nebi'im*) hinter dich gedrängt". Der Vorwurf ist unüberhörbar. "Jene" zeihet Jeremia der Eigeninitiative, des Wunschdenkens, der fehlenden Berufung, der Mißachtung des Gottesworts und beklagt sich im Gebet, daß sie sich offensichtlich über ihn erheben können. Die Klage der Konfession von Kap. 17 beschwert sich über die Bedrängnis, in die sich Jeremia durch die "Kollegen" gebracht sieht⁽³⁵⁾.

(31) *'ānûš* — singular auf "Tag" bezogen — sonst im Jer-Buch "tödlich", vgl. z.B. 15,18; 30,15 u.a.

(32) Zu diesem Konflikt vgl. J. M. BERRIDGE, *Prophet*, 137 ff.

(33) MT: *r'h* I 'hüten'(?); Versionen: *r'h* 'schlecht', 'böse'.

(34) Als Nominalform *r'h* (vgl. Jdc 14,20; Qoh 12,1 (?)) vielleicht die Bezeichnung für eine Standesgruppe, Clique, Kreis von Genossen o.ä.

(35) Wegen einer gewissen Überlänge und im Blick auf die durchgehende

VI

Man erinnert sich, daß ein ähnlich strukturiertes Logion von Maschal-Charakter⁽³⁶⁾ nach Jer 12,5 als Antwort auf Jeremias Klage erging⁽³⁷⁾:

"Wenn schon der Wettlauf mit Fußgängern dich ermüdet,
wie willst du mit Pferden um die Wette laufen?
Wenn du schon im friedlichen Land hinfällst⁽³⁸⁾,
wie wirst du dich verhalten im Dickicht des Jordans?"

Zumindest ähnliche Logien ergeben auch auf die Klagen in der Konfession 15,10-21. So antwortet offenbar das Wort in 15,11f., das wir so übersetzen:

"Ich habe dich doch gegen Nachrede gewappnet (hart gemacht)⁽³⁹⁾
und habe auf dich (nicht) treffen lassen (Schrecken?)...⁽⁴⁰⁾
Zerbricht Eisen vor Pfeilspitzen aus Erz?"⁽⁴¹⁾

offensichtlich auf die Klage von 15,10: "Weh mir, meine Mutter...". Das Wort 15,19:

"Wenn du umkehrst, werde ich dich wieder umkehren lassen:

Alliteration ' könnte man sich fragen, ob *mr'h* nicht auch als Glosse aufgefaßt werden könnte. Die Ironie liegt in der Charakterisierung als "Drängler", "Eiferer" — bezogen auf den Prophetenberuf (1.Hälfte) wie auf das Prophetenwort (2.Hälfte).

⁽³⁶⁾ T. R. Hobbs nennt diese mit dem Gleichnis verwandte Form der Rede "progressive comparison" (fortschreitender Vergleich) im Fragestil ("Some Proverbial Reflections", 69f). Zu vergleichen wäre Prv 11,31; 15,11.

⁽³⁷⁾ Wahrscheinlich ist 11,18; 12,6 als Klage und 12,5 als Antwort der innere Kern des Komplexes.

⁽³⁸⁾ Zu *bṭḥ* II 'fallen' vgl. A. EHRMAN, "A Note on *bwṭḥ* in Jer. xii 5", JNES 5 (1960) 153; HALAT, 116.

⁽³⁹⁾ MT K: *šrr*, fest sein, 'festigen'; MT Q: *šrh* 'rüsten', 'panzern' (für den Streit, vgl. F. D. HUBMANN, "Die 'Konfessionen', 31f.). *ṭwb* IV 'nachreden' (vgl. HALAT, 356,352, nach Ps 39,3).

⁽⁴⁰⁾ *b' t < b' t* (*bi' ūt* statt *b' ēt* — der Rest besteht aus Ergänzungen zur Erklärung des nicht mehr verständlichen Textes.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Zu lesen wohl: *šprn nḥšt* statt *špwn w-*; ein *brzl* ist zu viel; *r''* II (=aram. *ršš* 'zerbrechen') oder I 'schlecht sein'. Vgl. meine Studie: "Restaurationsarbeiten an Jer 15,11-12", (noch unveröffentlicht).

in meinem Dienst darfst du bleiben;
und wenn du Edleres als das Gemeine herausbringst,
darfst du (wieder) wie mein Mund sein (d.i. als mein Mund
fungieren)“⁽⁴²⁾

antwortet eindeutig auf die Klage in 15,17f., wo der Prophet den Dienst quittieren will⁽⁴³⁾.

In diesem Zusammenhang fällt nun auf, daß die Klage in der Konfession 17,14-18 scheinbar keine Antwort erhält — es sei denn, man würde diese unter den unmittelbar vorangehenden Logien finden. So haben denn S. Mowinckel und W. Baumgartner⁽⁴⁴⁾ mit dem Gedanken gespielt⁽⁴⁵⁾, ob nicht das Logion von der Unergründbarkeit des menschlichen Herzens in 17,9f. als Antwort auf die Klage über die böartigen Worte und Taten der Verfolger von 17,14-18 in Frage käme.

“Tief ist das Herz und heillos.
Wer könnt’ es ergründen?
Ich, Jahwe, erforsche das Herz
und prüfe die Nieren”.

“Diese Antwort bedeutete eine sanfte Abweisung der allzu ungestümen Bitte, zugleich die Versicherung, daß Jahwe über den unschönen Rachewunsch hinweg in die Tiefen seines Herzens sehe und ihm

⁽⁴²⁾ Auch hier eine sehr drastische Gleichnisrede.

⁽⁴³⁾ Kern: V.17b.18. “Ich habe mich weg von deiner Hand abseits gesetzt” — entspricht “zurückkehren”, “umwenden” in V.19.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Vgl. W. BAUMGARTNER, *Die Klagegedichte des Jeremia* (BZAW 32; Gießen 1917) 44.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Ähnliche Vorstellungen schon bei C. H. CORNILL, *Das Buch Jeremia* (1905), und B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jeremia* (KHC XI; 1901) 146f. Cornill nennt es einen der “glücklichsten Gedanken Duhms”, V.9f. als Antwort auf die Klage V.14ff. zu verstehen (214). J. M. Berridge (Anm.21) und T. R. Hobbs (Anm.7) haben dann u.a. versucht, das Verhältnis der Logien 17,5-13 zu der Konfession 17,14ff. so zu bestimmen, daß 17,5-13 als das 17,15 anvisierte JHWH-Wort anzusehen sei. Neuere Kontextbestimmungen liegen vor von R. BRANDSCHEIDT, “Die Gerichtsklage des Propheten Jeremia im Kontext von Jer 17”, *TTZ* 91 (1982) 61-78; L. WISSER, *Jérémie, Critique de la Vie Sociale* (Le Monde de la Bible; Genève 1982) 83-86; H. MOTTU, *Les Confessions*, 101ff. Bei V.11 indes kommen sie über allgemeine Aussagen nicht hinaus (z.B. “personal experiences of the prophet are under discussion”, HOBBS, “Some Proverbial Reflections”, 71).

darum diesen Übereifer nicht allzu schwer anrechnen". Aber er verwirft den Gedanken: "Allein in 12_{st} 15_{19f} ist die Abweisung viel schärfer, die ganze Antwort tiefer und origineller". Auch ist 17,9f. vom "Psalmenstil" geprägt; "etwas Prophetisches findet sich darin nicht"⁽⁴⁶⁾.

Wäre aber nicht 17,11aα darauf eine sinnvolle Antwort? Hier gelten alle Einwendungen Baumgartners nicht: kein Psalmenstil — jedenfalls nicht im Bildwort —, aber Prophetisches, dazu Tiefe und Originalität — man wird das nicht bestreiten wollen. Der "Rufer" brütet, wo er nicht gelegt, d.h. befaßt sich — das Zitat beweist es (V.15) — mit Dingen, für die er keine Verantwortung hat, selbst für den Fall — wenn man das Gleichnis zuletzt noch etwas weiter ausziehen darf —, daß das eigene Gelege vernichtet wird. Das lehrt Kap. 36.

Als Hindernis für eine direkte Zusammenführung von 17,11 und 17,14ff. bleibt eigentlich nur das dazwischen stehende Logion 17,12f. Doch dieses spricht in seiner überlieferten Form vom Tempelheiligtum und von denen, die die "Quelle der Wasser des Lebens" und die "Hoffnung Israels" verlassen, wobei sich wiederum viel Prophetisches darin nicht finden läßt. Anders ist es schon bei einer zu rekonstruierenden Urform aus 17,12a.13bα etwa dieser Art:

"Einen Ehrensitz (bedeutet) das hohe Amt⁽⁴⁷⁾;

Abtrünnige⁽⁴⁸⁾ werden für die Unterwelt eingeschrieben!"⁽⁴⁹⁾

Das kann sich kaum auf die Klage in 17,15f. beziehen, denn dort ist von Abtrünnigkeit nicht die Rede, wohl aber von Zudringlichkeit im

⁽⁴⁶⁾ W. BAUMGARTNER, *Klagegedichte*, 44.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ *mārôm* 'Höhe', 'hochgelegene Stelle', 'hohe soziale Stellung' u.ä. (HALAT, 599). Die Beziehung zum Zion ist geläufig, scheint mir aber darum sekundär zu sein. Übrigens vermute ich, daß *mēri'sôn* in 17,12 eine textkritische Randbemerkung eines Abschreibers oder Tradenten darstellt, der anzeigen wollte, daß man hier ein "ursprüngliches" *mqwm* (statt *mrwm*) zu lesen und auf "unser Heiligtum" zu deuten habe. Die LXX überliefert diesen Papyrus bezeichnenderweise nicht. Haben wir es hier mit einer Vorform von *Qere* und *Ketib* zu tun?

⁽⁴⁸⁾ *j'sûrê*, sicher von *swr* abzuleiten (nach Q *w'sûraj*), vgl. HALAT, 707 und 399. V.13aβ erläutert den schwer verständlichen Satz V. 13bα. — *mqwh* könnte noch eine Nachwirkung der Stelle *mqwm/mrwm* sein. V.13aα leitet erkennbar über (JHWH 3.P., anders als im Kontext). V.13bβ ist abhängig von 2,13.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ HALAT, 88 (Nr.5); "? der š'ôl zugeschrieben" (480).

Zusammenhang einer Auseinandersetzung um die angemessene Haltung des Propheten. Davon aber handelt 17,11a⁽⁵⁰⁾.

Bei der Redaktion des Jeremia-Buches — so wäre zum Schluß zu folgern — ist vermutlich 17,11a von 17,16a, dem er als Antwort auf die Klage folgte, getrennt und durch 17,16bff. ersetzt worden⁽⁵¹⁾. Der Prophet sollte ja als Beter eines Klagepsalms und als leidender Gerechter dargestellt und ohne Tadel bleiben⁽⁵²⁾. Auch hat ja die dtr Bearbeitung des Komplexes Kap. 11–21 durchweg das Bestreben, die Prophetenworte je beschreibbaren und aktuellen Situationen zuzuordnen⁽⁵³⁾. Die neue Auftragserteilung in 17,19ff. mit ihrer konkreten Situationsangabe könnte ebenfalls der Anlaß sein, weshalb die ursprüngliche Antwort auf die prophetische Klage ersetzt und versetzt worden ist. 17,11a blieb aber als Gotteswort in der Logien-Reihe 17,5ff. stehen und so wenigstens in der Nähe zu 17,14ff. erhalten, bis das isolierte Bildwort allegorisch bearbeitet und didaktisch aufbereitet zum Paradigma für Unrechtsverhalten wurde. Der Ruf des “Rebhuhns” war damit endgültig ruiniert.

Bruderholzrain 62
CH-4102 Binningen BL

Klaus SEYBOLD

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Der Erwägung wert ist allerdings die Frage, ob 17,12f. (Urform) nicht eine Antwort auf die letzte Klage der Konfession 20,7ff. vorliegt, die ja eine radikale Absage Jeremias an die Berufung, ja an das eigene Leben zu enthalten scheint. Darauf wäre die Alternative “Ehrenthrone” oder “Unterwelt” eine in ihrer Souveränität mit 12,5; 15,11f.; 15,19; 17,11 etc. vergleichbare Antwort. Doch die “literarische” Entfernung erlaubt wohl nicht mehr als die Vermutung einer ursprünglichen Beziehung. Dies gilt auch für die Möglichkeit, 17,5f. mit 18,19f. zu verbinden.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Auch bei der Konfession in Kap. 11f. ist die ursprüngliche Reihenfolge (V.6 folgt auf V.5) offensichtlich umgekehrt.

⁽⁵²⁾ Diese Tendenz ist in den Konfessionstexten von Kap. 11;15;18;20 deutlich erkennbar.

⁽⁵³⁾ Am deutlichsten in der Disposition von 11,18–12,6, aber auch von 14f.;16;18;19;20, insbesondere an der nunmehr strukturtragenden Funktion der Prosatexte wahrnehmbar. Dies im einzelnen darzulegen, ist nicht mehr die Absicht dieser Studie.

SOMMAIRE

La comparaison de la perdrix-bartavelle, en Jér 17,11, — originellement sans doute quelque chose comme un proverbe — est interprétée dans son contexte. Il apparaît ainsi que dans l'ensemble traditionnel elle a trouvé une application secondaire comme avertissement quant à la richesse illégitime, et une application tierce comme partie de la collection de dits de sagesse en Jér 17,5-13. Primitivement toutefois elle semble appartenir aux comparaisons de la Parole divine, lesquelles se rencontrent plus d'une fois dans la réponse aux plaintes de Jérémie (comme en 12,5; 15,11; 15,19). Il faut supposer que la comparaison de la perdrix est en relation avec la plainte du prophète en 17,14 sv.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Some Signs of Jonah⁽¹⁾

A previous contribution in *Biblica* by the present writer offered the hypothesis that Mark deliberately does not have Jesus promising the sign of Jonah to his adversaries in Mark 8,12 because of the purpose peculiar to his Gospel: Mark wishes to show that Jesus is the Son of God in a unique sense, i.e., on a par with God. Hence Mark does not invoke the resurrection as a sign of divine authentication of who Jesus was and what Jesus did. Instead, Mark has Jesus taking God's place in giving witness and has Jesus give testimony about himself before the Sanhedrin. Jesus takes the place of God in giving witness that Jesus is Son of God⁽²⁾.

The contribution suggested that for Matthew and Luke, on the other hand, the risen Jesus is intended to function as a sign and hence each of these evangelists uses the risen Jesus prominently in his Gospel: through the risen Jesus God gives a divine authentication to what Jesus did and who Jesus was⁽³⁾.

The present note explores more in depth the sign of Jonah in Matthew and Luke and results in a confirmation of the above-mentioned article with regard to Luke but in a significantly different evaluation with regard to Matthew.

From the outset it should be noted that neither in Matthew (12,38-42; 16,1-4) nor in Luke (11,29-32) is there question of a sign being given at the time contemporary with the speaking of Jesus. A sign "will be given" (δοθήσεται) in Matthew (12,39; 16,4); the son of man "will be" (ἔσται) a sign in Luke (11,30). Nor, for that matter, does Matthew or Luke state that Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites at the time of his preaching. Luke 11,30 states that Jonah became (ἐγένετο) a sign, but this need not refer to the time of the preaching of Jonah. On the contrary, there is no indication in the Book of Jonah that Jonah's being in the belly of the sea monster was known to the Ninevites at the time of his preaching⁽⁴⁾. Such knowledge would

(1) The author wishes to acknowledge the benefit of criticism when the present paper was given as a "Research Report" at the Forty-Ninth General Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America held at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., August 7, 1986.

(2) J. SWETNAM, "No Sign of Jonah", *Bib* 66 (1985) 126-130.

(3) *Ibid.*, 126-128.

(4) Cf. JEREMIAS, art. "Ἰωνάς", *TWNT* III, 413 and note 26. Jeremias cites evidence that several non-biblical Jewish sources portray the miraculous rescue of Jonah as being known to the Ninevites. It is impossible to know if Matthew and

undermine the strictures of Jesus against his adversaries for their refusal to believe: he could hardly compare them unfavorably to the Ninevites if the Ninevites had a motive for belief which Jesus' adversaries lacked. The logic of the texts of both Matthew and Luke (and Mark as well) is against Jonah being a sign to the Ninevites at the time of Jonah's preaching.

A fundamental difficulty involved in trying to understand the sign of Jonah in both Matthew and Luke is the instinctive tendency to look upon Jonah as a sign (i.e., as one authenticated in a marvelous, visible way by God) because of his striking deliverance from the sea monster. But that is not the only possibility for a sign found in the Book of Jonah. Another possibility is God's staying his wrath and not destroying Nineveh as he had told Jonah he would. "Forty days more, and Nineveh shall be destroyed" (Jonah 3,10). This was the threat of Jonah which brought the Ninevites to repentance (Jonah 3,5-9), and this repentance in turn "induced" God to relent (Jonah 3,10). The failure of God to destroy Nineveh is thus the sign which authenticates Jonah's preaching. In the gospel setting of a demand for a sign Jesus does not resort to an explicit prophecy about the destruction of a city, for it is implicit in the mention of Jonah and his preaching⁽⁵⁾.

The prophecy involving the destruction of a city is implicit in the pericopes concerning the sign of Jonah, but it is explicit elsewhere in Matthew and Luke (Matt 23,37-39 taken in conjunction with Matt 24,1-2.15-21; and Luke 13,31-35 taken in conjunction with Luke 21,5-6.20-24)⁽⁶⁾.

Granted the relevance of the destruction of Jerusalem for the sign of Jonah (part of the hypothesis which the present note is proposing), it seems that Matthew and Luke view the "sign" itself each in a distinctive way.

Luke were aware of this tradition, but the logic of the argumentation which Jesus uses in their gospels indicates that if known it does not figure in their texts regarding the sign of Jonah.

⁽⁵⁾ Strictly speaking, such a "non-action" as the failure of God to destroy Nineveh would be difficult to construe as a "sign", for it presupposes the veracity of what Jonah is preaching. But as usual in the New Testament, Old Testament texts are being viewed in the perspective of New Testament beliefs. When the non-destruction of Nineveh is viewed in the perspective of the destruction of Jerusalem, it becomes a sign. On the use of the word "sign" (σημεῖον) with regard to the destruction of Jerusalem (more particularly, of the temple, which is the central theological aspect of the destruction of Jerusalem), cf. Matt 24,3 and Luke 21,7. The use of the word παρουσία in Matt 24,3 in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem opens up perspectives which are beyond the scope of the present article, but which are obviously relevant to the full understanding of the "sign of Jonah" in Matthew.

⁽⁶⁾ This listing of texts is not meant to be complete. But they are sufficient for the purposes of the present article. A more ample treatment would have to take into account such texts as Matt 22,7, where the parable of the marriage feast clearly alludes to the destruction of Jerusalem (cf. J. DRURY, *The Parables in the Gospels. History and Allegory* [London 1985] 123. Luke omits the destruction in his version. Drury (ibid., 123-124) offers various suggestions as to the reason, but the principal reason could be that the destruction does not fit into his understanding of the sign of Jonah. Certainly the destruction of Jerusalem is important for Luke (cf. C. H. GIBLIN, *The Destruction of Jerusalem According to Luke's Gospel: A Historical-Typological Moral* [AnBib 107; Rome 1985]).

Luke says explicitly that “Just as Jonah became a sign for the Ninevites, so the son of man will be [a sign] for this generation” (11,30). Here Luke interprets the phrase “sign of Jonah” (σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ) as involving a genitive of apposition, i.e., the sign is Jonah himself⁽⁷⁾. There is no denial that the destruction of Jerusalem could be interpreted as a sign; but this interpretation is ignored in favor of one which makes Jesus himself become the sign. In the context of Luke’s Gospel and of his Acts this sign is not difficult to identify—it is the risen Christ. This is clear from the remarks attributed to Peter (Acts 10,42: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ὠρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν) and to Paul (Acts 17,31: πίστιν παρασχὼν πᾶσιν ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν). A confirmation is the role assigned to the apostles: they are at first “witnesses” (μάρτυρες) of the need for the Messiah to suffer and rise from the dead and for penance for sins to be preached (Luke 24,46–48); then (Acts 1,22) this is reduced to witnessing to the risen Christ. The importance of witness is repeated with almost monotonous insistence (1,8; 2,32; 3,15; 5,32; 10,41). This prepares the way for the difficulty which Paul has with the Gentiles at Athens (Acts 17,32), but more to the point in the context of the sign of Jonah in Luke, it prepares the way for the difficulty which Paul has with the representatives of traditional Judaism (Acts 23–24)⁽⁸⁾.

Luke certainly was aware of the similarity between Jonah and Jesus arising from their respective “three-day” sojourns in places from which they were spectacularly released: as one aware of the story of Jonah in the Old Testament and of Jesus’ resurrection he could not have failed to note the similarity, apart from traditions to which he had access. In this light the words καθὼς γὰρ ἐγένετο Ἰωνᾶς τοῖς Νινευίταις σημεῖον, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ (11,30) take on the nuance of an implicit demurrer with regard to the use of the miraculous liberation of Jonah as the point of the comparison, for this was *not* how Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites. Both Jonah and Jesus became signs, but in different ways: Jonah became a sign through the non-destruction of Nineveh; Jesus became a sign through his resurrection. Failure to recognize the different ways in which each became signs has bedeviled the exegesis of the “sign of Jonah” in Luke.

Matthew seems to take a different approach to the precise meaning of “sign” in the phrase “sign of Jonah”. An exact reading of the text is essential:

- 12,38 Then some of the scribes and Pharisees answered him with the 39 words, “Teacher, we wish to see a sign”. He said to them in reply: “An evil and adulterous generation looks for a sign, and a sign will not 40 be given it except for the sign of Jonah the prophet. For [γάρ] just as Jonah was in the belly of the sea monster for three days and

(7) Cf. SWETNAM, “No Sign of Jonah”, 126 and note 5.

(8) Cf. DRURY, *Parables*, 150.

three nights, so will the son of man be in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights⁽⁹⁾.

The word "for"—γάρ—is usually presumed to give the content of the sign, i.e., the γάρ is interpreted as referring back explicitly to the expressed meaning of the preceding verse. Thus v. 40 is normally understood to explain that the sign to be given the wicked generation is the sign of the risen Christ⁽¹⁰⁾. This is grammatically possible, but it has the disadvantage of leading into the *cul de sac* of implying that Jonah was a sign for the Ninevites because of his sojourn in the belly of the beast and his marvelous escape. Much more appropriate would be an interpretation which takes γάρ as referring not to what is expressed but to what is implied in the preceding verse⁽¹¹⁾. Thus at Matt 2,2 the Magi ask "Where is the one born king of the Jews? [He has truly been born] for we saw his star..."⁽¹²⁾. At Matt 12,39-40 the interpretation would run: "An evil and adulterous generation looks for a sign, and a sign will not be given it except for the sign of Jonah the prophet. [The son of man is justified in prophesying as Jonah did] for [γάρ] just as Jonah was in the belly of the sea monster for three days and three nights, so will the son of man be in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights". In this reading of the text the "sign of Jonah" is not Jonah himself as in Luke (although Matthew must have seen this as a possibility), but the sign which Jonah gives as a prophet, i.e., Jonah is a possessive genitive. The sign which Jonah gives as a prophet is the prophecy of the destruction of Nineveh; in the case of the son of man, of the destruction of Jerusalem.

In the light of this interpretation it is noteworthy that in Matthew no sign will be given "except the sign of Jonah *the prophet*" (12,39), whereas in Luke no sign will be given "except the sign of Jonah" (11,29).

In Matthew, then, the comparison between the sojourns of Jonah and Jesus in the belly of the sea monster is the ground justifying the comparison between Jesus and Jonah so that the prophecy of Jesus regarding the destruction of a city can legitimately be called a "sign of Jonah". In Luke, the comparison between the sojourns of Jonah and Jesus in the belly of the sea monster is not necessary for the argumentation; the fact that both Jesus and Jonah were each vindicated by God—Jesus by resurrection and Jonah by the non-destruction of Nineveh—is the point which Luke seizes on to show that both Jesus and Jonah become signs.

The pericopes of the sign of Jonah in Matthew and Luke close in a

⁽⁹⁾ Translation by the present author.

⁽¹⁰⁾ This was the way the present author understood it in "No Sign of Jonah". Considerable reflection subsequently indicated that such an interpretation leads to insoluble problems preventing a straightforward interpretation (presuming, of course, that the text as it stands does not involve insoluble problems presenting a straightforward solution).

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf. F. W. GINGRICH—F. W. DANKER (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago-London 1979) l.e (p. 152).

⁽¹²⁾ Ibid. Other examples are given (e.g., Mark 8,35 and Luke 9,24).

curious example of inverse parallelism. Matthew has the men of Nineveh rising up on Judgment Day with "this generation" and judging it because the Ninevites repented at the preaching of Jonah, "and behold a greater than Jonah is here" (12,41). This is followed by the "queen of the south" who rises on Judgment Day with "this generation" and judges it because she came from the "ends of the earth" to hear the wisdom of Solomon, "and behold a greater than Solomon is here" (12,42). Luke has almost the same wording, but the two examples are reversed. Both examples have clearly been chosen because they concern non-Israelites. But this is not sufficient to explain why the order of the examples is different.

In the light of the interpretation of the "sign of Jonah" given above for each of the two evangelists, an attempt at an interpretation of these enigmatic verses is also in order.

The two interpretations given above to the phrase "sign of Jonah" would seem a priori to be not irrelevant to the two comparisons. The "preaching" (κήρυγμα) of Jonah involves the prophecy of the destruction of Nineveh; Jesus is greater because, presumably, his preaching is for Matthew and Luke not only from a more authoritative source but also involves a much more important city. The reference to the queen of the south and Solomon is less easy to decipher. Perhaps one would not be too far astray in seeing the reason for the mention of Solomon in his relation to temple-building⁽¹³⁾. This interpretation makes possible a common denominator between the two sayings and each of the "signs of Jonah": Jesus is preaching the destruction of the temple unless his call to repentance is heard (comparison with the preaching of Jonah); Jesus is builder of a new temple (comparison with the wisdom of Solomon). In Matthew the example involving the preaching of Jonah comes first because the destruction of the temple is involved in the nature of the sign of Jonah in Matthew; in Luke the example involving the wisdom of Solomon comes first because the raising up of the new temple is involved in the nature of the sign of Jonah in Luke. The key background verse for this exegesis is Matt 26,61: Jesus is presented as affirming that he would destroy the temple—the sign of Jonah in Matthew—and in three days rebuild it—the sign of Jonah in Luke⁽¹⁴⁾.

Perhaps there is another dimension to the examples of the preaching of

⁽¹³⁾ Cf. Acts 7,47.

⁽¹⁴⁾ The section of Luke's trial scene corresponding to Matthew's presentation of the false witnesses is missing. Perhaps it was omitted by Luke in order to make use of the charges concerning the temple as an introduction to the stoning of Stephen (Acts 6,14; cf. G. SCHNEIDER, *Verleugnung, Verspottung und Verhör Jesu nach Lukas 22,54-71. Studien zur lukanischen Darstellung der Passion* [SANT 22; München 1969] 129-130). As a preliminary to the Stephen speech the charges serve as a necessary key to the understanding of that subtle elaboration on the inadequacy of the temple and its replacement by the true temple not built by hands. The "false witnesses" of Acts 6,13 seem to be false because they remove the condition of repentance from Jesus' prophecy about the destruction. For other suggestions about the solution to this complex problem cf. R. J. MCKELVEY, *The New Temple. The Church in the New Testament* (London 1969) 67-72.

Jonah and the wisdom of Solomon on the supposition that the former involves the destruction of Jerusalem and the latter involves the raising up of the new temple of Christ's body: the two events are related to each other in the order of signs. The risen Jesus will be a sign of God's validation and thus will be a sign that the destruction of Jerusalem will take place (Luke's order). The destruction of Jerusalem will be a sign that the one prophesying it truly partook of the prefiguration of Jonah by being miraculously delivered through resurrection (Matthew's order)⁽¹⁵⁾.

Thus the sign of Jonah in Matthew is of a piece with Matthew's purpose of linking the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple with the failure of the Jews to accept Jesus' call to repentance. And thus the sign of Jonah in Luke is of a piece with Luke's purpose of linking the risen Jesus with the failure of the Jews to accept Jesus' call to repentance. Thus, finally, the absence of the sign of Jonah in Mark is balanced by its presence in Matthew and Luke involving matters which, as in Mark, go to the very heart of the identity and mission of Jesus.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

James SWETNAM, S.J.

⁽¹⁵⁾ The falsity of the witnesses against Jesus in Matt 26,60-61 could consist in their reversing the order of Jesus' prophesying—first the destruction of the temple and then the raising up of another temple. This order involves an action of Jesus not divinely legitimized.

“He Set His Face”: Luke 9,51 Once Again

In a previous study I have suggested that the expression, “he set his face” (Luke 9,51), connotes the idea of judgment⁽¹⁾. Further reflection and recent scholarship concerned with the evangelist Luke’s understanding of the significance of the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 call for re-examination of this verse.

In a study that has significantly advanced our understanding of the evangelist Luke’s interpretation of the destruction of Jerusalem, C. H. Giblin sees awareness of the doom of Jerusalem emerge in the second and third major divisions of Jesus’ adult ministry (i.e., 9,51–19,27 and 19,28–24,53; the first division would be 3,1–9,50)⁽²⁾. In his second division (9,51–19,27) Giblin argues that the fate of Jerusalem is only hinted at in a few passages (such as 10,10-16; 13,1-5.31-35; 19,11-27). Jesus does not explicitly pronounce judgment upon the city until 19,41-45 (and again in 21,20-24 and 23,26-31). His analysis is helpful, and I think that in this respect his interpretation is essentially sound. However, with reference to 9,51 Giblin concludes that Jesus announces only his intention to go to Jerusalem with no aspect of judgment hinted at, even though such a hint, if there should be any, would accord well with his overall interpretation of this portion of Luke’s gospel. Giblin avers that “the text demands and allows for nothing beyond an announcement of Jesus’ firm intention to journey towards” Jerusalem⁽³⁾. However, Giblin’s interpretation at this point may be unnecessarily limited.

All Lucan interpreters agree that at 9,51 (“When the days drew near for him to be received up, he set his face to go to Jerusalem”) a major narrative shift takes place. The Galilean ministry is at an end, and now Jesus goes to Jerusalem to meet his fate. But what exactly does this biblical expression, “he set his face”, imply? Certainly it suggests resolute determination, as Giblin and most commentators readily agree⁽⁴⁾. The verb *στηρίζειν* (derived from the LXX) would connote this idea (lit. “to be strong”), while often the

⁽¹⁾ C. A. EVANS, “‘He Set His Face’: A Note on Luke 9,51”, *Bib* 63 (1982) 545-548.

⁽²⁾ C. H. GIBLIN, *The Destruction of Jerusalem according to Luke’s Gospel: A Historical-Typological Moral* (AnBib 107; Rome 1985).

⁽³⁾ GIBLIN, *Destruction*, 31-32, quote from p. 32.

⁽⁴⁾ GIBLIN, *Destruction*, 32; I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Exeter 1978) 405; J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)* (AB 28; Garden City 1981) 823. That the expression is indeed biblical (i.e., septuagintal) is not in doubt. Several septuagintalisms are present in 9,51-56; cf. H. F. D. SPARKS, “The Semitisms of St. Luke’s Gospel”, *JTS* 44 (1943) 129-138; EVANS, “Note on Luke 9,51”, 546, n. 6.

underlying Hebrew words (שָׁחַ, שָׁחַ) mean about the same thing. The question, however, is whether or not the expression may contribute to this section's sense of something ominous hanging over Jerusalem, as Giblin himself describes it. In the Old Testament, this expression, either in the indicative ("he set his face") or especially in the imperative ("set your face"), often connotes a sense of judgment (e.g., Isa 50,7; Jer 3,12; 21,20), especially as it is found in Ezekiel (e.g., 6,2; 13,17; 20,46 [21,2, LXX]; 21,2 [21,7, LXX]), the most likely source from which Luke derived this language. In composing some of Jesus' oracles regarding the impending second siege and destruction, Luke has utilized some of Ezekiel's prophetic language (as well as that of some of the other prophets) describing the siege and first destruction of Jerusalem (compare Luke 19,41-44; 21,20-24 with Ezek 4,1-3; 21,6-12,22). In fact, Giblin himself notes that Ezek 4,1-2 is alluded to in Luke 19,44 (p. 56), Ezek 9,1 in Luke 21,20 (p. 87), and Ezek 20,45-21,7 in Luke 23,31 (p. 102). It is important to note that all of these passages are either unique to Luke or heavily redacted. Since the expression, "set your face", occurs frequently in Ezekiel, an Old Testament book that has made contributions to various portions of Luke, especially those distinctively Lucan, it is not unreasonable to suspect that underlying the Lucan expression in 9,51, another passage unique to Luke, is once again Ezekiel⁽⁵⁾. Furthermore, since these prophetic contributions from Ezekiel usually contribute to Luke's depiction of Jerusalem's grim fate, our suspicion that Ezekiel not only underlies Luke 9,51, but lends the passage a sense of the ominous, is strengthened. Moreover, the fact that Jesus' favorite self-designation is "Son of Man", which occurs a few verses earlier in 9,44, and which happens to be the most common designation for the prophet Ezekiel as well (e.g., 4,1; 8,17; 20,45; 21,2.6.12 *passim*—note that this expression occurs in, or within close proximity to, those passages thought to have been utilized by the evangelist), would also add conviction to our suspicion. The passage that Luke most likely has in mind is Ezek 21,2-6: "Son of man, set your face toward Jerusalem and preach against the sanctuaries; prophesy against the land of Israel and say to the land of Israel, Thus says the Lord: Behold, I am against you, and will draw forth my sword out of its sheath. . . . Sigh therefore, son of man; sigh with breaking heart and bitter grief before their eyes" (RSV). There are at least three good reasons for suspecting that this passage (though not necessarily to the exclusion of others) underlies the expression, "he set his face to go to Jerusalem", in Luke 9,51: (1) As in the passage from Ezekiel, the "setting of the face" is in reference to Jerusalem. (2) The Ezekiel passage falls within the larger passage (20,45-21,7) that perhaps has inspired the utterance found in Luke 23,31. If this is so⁽⁶⁾, then this would show that Luke may very well have been acquainted with this particular passage. (3) Just as Ezekiel was grieved and

⁽⁵⁾ Luke appears to weave into his account extensive amounts of Old Testament materials (e.g., large portions of 1 and 2 Kings in Luke 7-10; 22-24; Acts 1-9; most of Deuteronomy 1-26 in Luke 10,1-18,14; as well as numerous allusions to words and phrases).

⁽⁶⁾ GIBLIN, *Destruction*, 102-103, doubts that this passage best explains Luke 23,31. He finds in the rabbinic writings what he deems to be closer parallels.

spoke a word of judgment against Jerusalem and her sanctuaries, so Jesus, when he arrives at Jerusalem, weeps over the city (19,41; compare Ezek 21,6) and speaks a word of judgment (19,43-44; compare Ezek 21,2-6, esp. v.2)(7).

Another feature which may have some relevance for our analysis is the question of whether this expression connotes a sense of dispatch. In the case of the expression as it is employed by Ezekiel, W. H. Brownlee has so argued(8). The fact that the expression in Luke occurs right at the very beginning of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and only a few verses before Jesus himself dispatches the seventy-two with a message and mission (10,1-12) may only be a coincidence, but the possibility that this expression may have been understood as having something to do with being dispatched with a message ought at least to be considered. Moreover, since Jesus' message for Jerusalem, like that of Ezekiel's, is essentially a negative one, the possibility becomes more suggestive.

Giblin notes that the context suggests that no judgment is in view because of the clemency that Jesus shows the Samaritans, who had rejected Jesus "because his face was set toward Jerusalem" (9,53). He reasons: "If there were a judgmental tone regarding the Jewish capital in Luke's phraseology in v. 51, it would be very strange for Luke immediately to note the Samaritans' hostility to Jesus as he proceeds 'against' Jerusalem"(9). It would be strange, I agree, if the Samaritans opposed Jesus knowing fully well that he intended to pronounce a judgment upon the city. (And this I readily acknowledge to be Giblin's strongest point.) But their opposition is likely motivated because of Jesus' interest in Jerusalem. They refuse him because he is perceived to be part of Judaism. He is a prophet whose destiny will be met at Jerusalem (13,33-35). The response of the disciples, who seem to be in a judgmental mood, to say the least, is to call fire down upon the Samaritans. Obviously the element of judgment is present in this context, but what to make of it is the problem. Something seems to have suggested to the disciples that Jesus means business. Any town that rejects him will face judgment. This we see in the instructions for the seventy-two and the later speeches concerning Jerusalem herself. Therefore, when confronted by the Samaritan rejection, they expect a dramatic act of judgment. There is no thought that there may be a postponement of judgment(10). Such a disposi-

(7) FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 828, says this of the expression in 9,51: "Here perhaps one should recall the mission of the prophet Ezekiel to the city of Jerusalem (Ezekiel 8-11)". Similarly, J. H. DAVIES, "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel", *Studia Evangelica*, vol. 2 (= TU 87; ed. F. L. CROSS; Berlin 1964) 164-169, believes that the expression is derived from Ezekiel and that the idea of judgment is present.

(8) W. H. BROWNLEE, "Ezekiel", *ISBE* 2 (1982) 254-255; idem, "'Son of Man Set Your Face': Ezekiel the Refugee Prophet", *HUCA* 54 (1983) 83-110.

(9) GIBLIN, *Destruction*, 32. In my study I acknowledge that the preposition ἐπί (=π), which is usually present in the expression, "set his face against", is of course not present in Luke 9,51 or 53. If it were, then the expression would not connote or hint at judgment, but would unambiguously denote such.

(10) As is taught by the parable of the unproductive fig tree (13,6-9).

tion on the part of the disciples would become more intelligible if the expression in 9,51 was indeed meant to be ominous. As the passage now stands, the incident involving the Samaritans reveals that Jesus is merciful and does not wish judgment to fall upon anyone (compare his attitude of concern in 23,26-31)⁽¹¹⁾. In his later dispatch of the seventy-two (Luke 10,1-12), however, Jesus tells his disciples that it will "be more tolerable on that day for Sodom than for [the] town" that rejects his messengers (v. 12). Moreover, these instructions are followed by woes pronounced on the unrepentant cities of Chorazin and Bethsaida, in which warning of future judgment is made explicit (vv. 13-15). At its very outset, then, the journey to Jerusalem does indeed appear to forebode ill for some of those cities to which Jesus goes.

The reference to the nearness of Jesus' time "to be received up" certainly anticipates the events of the passion, particularly the crucifixion and ascension⁽¹²⁾. It is in this final period of his life, of course, that Jesus pronounces explicit words of judgment upon the stubborn city (19,41-45; 20,20-24; 23,28-31). In killing the one sent to her the city has sealed its own fate. This constitutes only a minor point, and perhaps it is irrelevant, but it could add contextual support to my suggestion that 9,51 forebodes judgment.

In conclusion I find the question not easily decided. In favor of understanding the expression as hinting at judgment would be the strong possibility that the phrase goes back to Ezekiel and, if so, then a judgmental tone is most likely. However, if the phrase cannot be traced back to Ezekiel, then the connotation of judgment, though by no means eliminated, is more remote. Moreover, the context itself is open to opposing interpretations. On the one hand, it is possible to see in the repetition of the expression in 9,53 an unlikelihood of any idea of judgment. On the other hand, however, the reaction of the disciples, and part of Jesus' instructions and sayings to the seventy-two seem to indicate that 9,51 is meant to forebode judgment. Giblin has contested my interpretation because it is, apparently, not "in line with Luke's forthright clarity of expression"⁽¹³⁾. This is an important issue, for it has much to do with the whole question of Luke's use of the Old Testament. I tend to view the evangelist's use of the Old Testament as ranging from the obvious to the subtle, that is, from explicit citation and/or comment, to allusion. As an example of the subtle, in the infancy narrative Luke alludes to the rearing of Samuel in the Temple (compare Luke 1,80; 2,40.52 with 1 Sam 2,26), which would be clear only to those who know their Old Testament stories well. Moreover, as an example closer to home,

⁽¹¹⁾ The reason that judgment will inevitably fall upon Jerusalem (or upon any other city for that matter) is, as Giblin puts it (p.105), "surely not Jesus' personal hostility to the inhabitants of the city". This is an important observation, for it points to a crucial distinction between the compassionate prophet Jesus, on the one hand, and the terrible judgment that God, on the other, will bring upon the unrepentant city.

⁽¹²⁾ FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 827-828, seems undecided, but appears to lean toward seeing ἀνάλημνις as referring to more than Jesus' actual ascension. I would think that given the context, it would be odd to understand it otherwise.

⁽¹³⁾ GIBLIN, *Destruction*, 32.

the exchange between Jesus and a would-be follower in Luke 9,61-62 surely is meant to allude to Elijah's call of Elisha (1 Kgs 19,19-20). But is such a subtle allusion forthrightly clear? Obviously not to all. I believe that the evangelist Luke does write with "forthright clarity of expression", but what we moderns cannot always divine is at what level of understanding the original audience lived. Judging by its septuagintal language and numerous allusions to the Old Testament (both to individual texts and to larger units), I think that it is fair to conclude that Luke wrote for an audience that was very familiar with its Greek Old Testament, an audience that was expected to dig out of the Old Testament much about Christ and his Church (see Luke 24,25-27.45-56). Therefore, I think that it is quite possible, if not probable (though by no means certain), that in using the expression in 9,51, "he set his face", the evangelist alludes to Ezekiel; and in alluding to this prophetic book he hints at the city's impending judgment⁽¹⁴⁾.

Trinity Western University
7600 Glover Road
Langley, B.C., Canada V3A 4R9

Craig A. EVANS

⁽¹⁴⁾ One may agree or disagree with my assessment of the evidence, or with the clarity or logic of its presentation, but I should hope that no one would describe it, as Giblin did my earlier study, as "exegetical sophistry" (cf. GIBLIN, *Destruction*, 32).

A Recently Discovered Folio of the Old Syriac (Sy^c) Text of Luke 16,13-17,1

The venerable *Deir el Suryan* in the *Wadi el Natrun* in Egypt is the source for most of the world's oldest known Syriac manuscripts, most of which now reside in the British Museum and Vatican libraries. Supposedly the vein had been mined out. However, since so many variables can be at work in an oriental library, it is never safe to assume that all the manuscripts in such a library have been found. It was felt that the last chapter had not yet been written in the history of the Syriac manuscripts at *Deir el Suryan*. This proved to be the case when I made my first visit to the monastery in November, 1985.

Of the various ancient parchment texts found there, one immediately stood out on paleographic grounds. It was a parchment folio, 8" × 10", with two columns of text in the most archaic style of estrangelo script. The impressive antiquity of the folio proved to be a token of the antiquity of the text it held. At first glance, it was clear to see that this folio was from an ancient gospel code. Upon further examination, while determining what scriptures it contained, I immediately noticed that before me was a text foreign to that of the Peshitta text of Luke 16,13-17,1, yet it clearly was not in the Harklean style. My next thought, that I had discovered a folio of the Old Syriac text of Luke, was almost too much to believe. Was I in the wrong gospel? Did the parable of the rich man and Lazarus occur in some other gospel than Luke? Double and triple checks were made with a concordance and the Peshitta. The parable of the rich man and Lazarus is only in Luke. A look at the Old Syriac (Sy^s) version of Luke confirmed what I dared not contemplate: I had before me an unknown folio from the Old Syriac text of Luke, nothing of which has been found since 1892 when Mrs. Lewis made her amazing discovery on Mt. Sinai⁽¹⁾. Further examination proved that it is part of the Curetonian gospel codex in the British Museum. This was determined not only on paleographic grounds, but also by the fact that the text of this folio begins exactly where the Curetonian manuscript ends, Luke 16,12; and it ends exactly where one of the three Sy^c folios in the Royal Library of Berlin (Ms. Orient Quad. 528) resumes the text, namely Luke 17,1. There can be no doubt that this folio, discovered in the former resting place of Sy^c, is a missing folio of Sy^c.

(1) A. S. LEWIS, *The Old Syriac Gospels* (London 1910) III.

- [illegible]

V. 28	ܐܠܗܐ] ܐܠܗܐ	
V. 29	ܐܠܗܐ] ܐܠܗܐ	P, Aphr. 908, Sy ^{Pa1} , many Greek and Latin mss.
V. 31	ܐܠܗܐ] ܐܠܗܐ	P, Aphr. 908
	ܐܠܗܐ] ܐܠܗܐ	
17,1	ܐܠܗܐ] ܐܠܗܐ	P

As can be seen, there are some very archaic readings that have come to light, especially in the text of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Many of the readings Aphrahat quoted from this section were unique and, without further support, would have to have been considered paraphrastic in nature, but now with the evidence of this new folio, it can be seen that these were based upon an actual archaic textual tradition. Though Sy^s usually presents the more ancient text when compared with Sy^e, it appears that in this parable, the newly discovered folio presents several less revised and thus more ancient readings than Sy^s. This is indicated by the agreements with Aphrahat and Ephrem against Sy^s and P. The study of the text of this parable is facilitated because it only occurs in Luke and thus was not subjected to harmonistic alterations. This folio is a very significant contribution to the study of the text of this parable, where its text seems to present even more archaic readings than Sy^s.

1300 W. 12th
Emporia, KS 66801
U.S.A.

Daniel L. McCONAUGHY

La unción de Salomón y la entrada de Jesús en Jerusalén: 1 Re 1,33-40/Lc 19,35-40

Suele admitirse que el grueso del episodio de la entrada de Jesús en Jerusalén tal como la describe Lucas (Lc 19,28-40) deriva del pasaje paralelo de Marcos (Mc 11,1-10)⁽¹⁾. Algunos autores han intentado mostrar que Lucas utilizó otra fuente además de Marcos para la redacción de los vv.29-36.38, y no falta quien ha postulado un influjo de la tradición joánica para explicar las diferencias del relato lucano frente al de los otros sinópticos. Sin embargo, ninguna de las dos hipótesis ha logrado abrirse camino entre los estudiosos, y hoy por hoy no logran imponerse ante la crítica como convincentes⁽²⁾. No obstante, los problemas que plantea la entrada en Jerusalén en la versión lucana están lejos de haberse aclarado. Ciertamente hay algunos elementos propios de la redacción de Lucas (καὶ ἐγένετο v.29; substitución del φέρουσιν de Mc por ἡγάγον v.35; empleo del genitivo absoluto como λυόντων δὲ αὐτῶν, πορευομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ vv.35.36, etc.), pero no bastan para explicar todas las transformaciones que experimenta la narración en Lucas. El propio Fitzmyer advierte — y una simple ojeada a la *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* de K. Aland lo confirma — cómo a partir del v.36 Lc comienza a separarse considerablemente de Mc⁽³⁾.

Por otro lado, Lucas no hace uso de Zac 9,9, expresamente citado en Mateo y Juan como interpretación cristiana, mesiánica, del pasaje a la luz del Antiguo Testamento. Lucas no hace la menor referencia al texto de Zacarías, a excepción del nombre del animal πῶλος — siguiendo a Mc — en el que cabalga Jesús. En Lc tan sólo aparece la cita explícita del Sal 118,26 con el que se saludaba a los peregrinos que llegaban a Jerusalén para la fiesta, cita

(1) A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* (AB; Garden City, NY 1985) 1242 y 1252-53 para la bibliografía más importante sobre este pasaje.

(2) FITZMYER, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1242-44.

(3) FITZMYER, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1250: «Lucan redaction begins to depart from "Mk" considerably, probably to prepare for his form of the acclamation and the addition of vv.37, 39-40». También hay autores que han postulado otra fuente distinta para esta parte del relato, cf. Ch. BURGER, *Jesus als Davidsohn. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (FRLANT 98; Göttingen 1970) 112: «Da die Erzählung in ihrem ersten Teil sich deutlich an die Vorlage bei Markus anlehnt, um nach V. 36 desto entschiedener von ihr abzuweichen, ist die Frage umstritten, ob Lukas für diesen zweiten Teil eine weitere Quelle zu Gebote stand, oder ob er seine Markus-vorlage nur entschlossener bearbeitet hat». Como intentaremos mostrar más abajo, esta elaboración más profunda de Lucas comienza ya en el v.33.

que comparte con los otros evangelistas, pero con un importante cambio: la introducción de la palabra ὁ βασιλεύς, que falta en los textos conocidos del salmo. La inserción de esta palabra en la cita es claramente redaccional⁽⁴⁾ y el resultado conseguido es el siguiente: mientras los otros sinópticos aclaman a Jesús como peregrino que llega a Jerusalén para la Pascua, Lucas hace de su llegada una entrada regia⁽⁵⁾. Hasta aquí, en mi opinión, hay un acuerdo de base entre los críticos. Pero ¿podemos dar un paso más para esclarecer *parte* de los cambios introducidos por Lucas en la redacción de este pasaje? Pienso que sí, y mi propuesta es que hay indicios suficientes para pensar que Lc está evocando e imitando deliberadamente la unción por sorpresa del joven Salomón y la consiguiente procesión de entronización tal como se relata en 1 Re 1,33-40 LXX.

A. Ἐπεβίβασαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

El punto de arranque se sitúa en el uso peculiar que hace Lucas de una palabra clave que nos remite inequívocamente al pasaje de Reyes antes mencionado. En efecto, los discípulos «montaron a Jesús sobre la cabalgadura» (ἐπεβίβασαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν), lo mismo que Sadoc, el sacerdote, Natán el profeta y Baneas “montaron a Salomón en la mula del rey David” (ἐπεβίβασαν τὸν Σολομῶντα, 1 Re 1,38 según el texto antioqueno). Esta alusión a la unción de Salomón por medio de un verbo poco usual con esta construcción queda más al descubierto si lo comparamos con las expresiones utilizadas por los otros evangelistas: «montó en él» (ἐκάθισεν ἐπ’ αὐτόν Mc 11,7) y “montó sobre ellos” (ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν Mt 21,7)⁽⁶⁾. Es más, se puede pensar con cierta probabilidad que Lc, en el uso e imitación de este pasaje de Reyes, está siguiendo el texto antioqueno (o luciano) de Septuaginta. Pues, si bien es verdad que cuando el rey David decide la unción drástica de Salomón (1 Re 1,33) es toda la LXX la que emplea este verbo («montad a mi hijo Salomón sobre mi mula», ἐπιβιβάσατε τὸν υἱόν μου Σαλωμών ἐπὶ τὴν ἡμίονον τὴν ἐμήν), en el momento de realizarse la unción es el texto antioqueno el único que emplea por dos veces dicho verbo (vv.38 y 44) frente al ἐπεκάθισαν de LXX *rell.*⁽⁷⁾. Veámos de una forma gráfica el uso de este verbo en el texto antioqueno y en el resto de LXX a lo largo de 1 Re 1,33-44:

(4) Nótese que en Lc 13,35 se cita literal y correctamente el mismo versículo de este salmo.

(5) A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (AB; Garden City, NY 1981) 216 y id., *Luke X-XXIV*, 1246.

(6) Mateo describe a Jesús sentado sobre los dos animales (!) siguiendo a LXX que traduce por καί el *waw* explicativo de Zac 9,9, cf. FITZMYER, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1248.

(7) La edición seguida del texto luciano o antioqueno se encuentra en P. DE LAGARDE, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canoniorum Pars Prior Graece* (Göttingen 1883). Hay que advertir que el texto antioqueno prolonga el libro segundo de Samuel hasta la muerte del rey David (1 Re 2,11). En consecuencia, el texto citado se encuentra en la edición de Lagarde en 2 Sam 25,33-40. Pero las variantes de los manuscritos antioquenos *boc2e2* se registran mejor en el aparato crítico de

LXX *rell**Ant (mss. boc2e2)*

v.33 ἐπιβίβασατε...κατάγητε
v.38 ἐπεκάθισαν τὸν Σαλωμών
v.44 ἐπεκάθισαν αὐτόν

ἐπιβίβασατε...καταβίβασατε
ἐπεβίβασαν τὸν Σολομώντα
ἐπεβίβασαν αὐτόν

Aunque un solo ejemplo no puede ser concluyente respecto al uso de un texto antioqueno por parte de Lucas, merece ser tenido en cuenta para futuras investigaciones, sobre todo si atendemos a la gran probabilidad del origen antioqueno de dicho evangelista⁽⁸⁾, la existencia de un texto Protoluciánico ya en el s. I d. C.⁽⁹⁾ o al menos la convicción por parte de los especialistas de que este texto conserva material muy antiguo de Septuaginta, así como otros indicios de que Lucas ha utilizado en algunas de sus citas bíblicas un texto de estas características⁽¹⁰⁾.

En todo caso, el uso que hace Lucas de este verbo no es casual. Es verdad que el 90% de su vocabulario se encuentra en la Septuaginta y que su estilo se asemeja sobre todo al de los libros históricos y 2 Macabeos⁽¹¹⁾. Sin embargo, el verbo ἐπιβιβάζειν no es demasiado usado en LXX y, por supuesto, es muy raro fuera de la Biblia griega. De las once veces que aparece en la Concordancia de Hatch-Redpath⁽¹²⁾, ocho veces se utiliza para traducir el *hif'il* de כָּרַךְ con el significado de «montar, cargar, hacer subir a un vehículo o animal». Mas sólo en este episodio de Salomón se utiliza para montar una caballería (ἐπὶ τὴν ἡμίονον), es decir, con la misma construcción que en Lc 19,35. De forma que no me parece verosímil atribuir a mera coincidencia el uso que hace Lucas de este verbo para describir la entrada de Jesús en Jerusalén.

Por otra parte, esta alusión deliberada a la unción de Salomón explicaría, a mi entender, la aparente contradicción entre el envío de dos discípulos en

la edición de A. E. BROOKE-N. MCLEAN-St. J. THACKERAY, *The Old Testament in Greek*. Vol. II: Part I. I and II Samuel (Cambridge 1927); Part II. I and II Kings (Cambridge 1930). Una nueva edición seguida del texto luciánico con su aparato crítico está preparando el equipo de la Biblia Griega de la Biblia Políglota Matritense en el Instituto de Filología del C.S.I.C. (Madrid).

⁽⁸⁾ FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 42-47.

⁽⁹⁾ N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, «El Protoluciánico, ¿revisión griega de los judíos de Antioquía?», *Bib* 64 (1983) 423-427.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Por ejemplo la cita de Ez 30,5 según el texto luciánico en la lista de pueblos de Act 2,9-11 como notó G. D. KILPATRICK, «Some Quotations in Acts», *Les Actes des Apôtres: traditions, rédaction, théologie* (ed. J. KREMER) (BETL XLVIII; Gembloux-Louvain 1979) 92-93. Adviértase que también Pablo en Rom 11,4 cita 1 Re 19,18 según el texto antioqueno (ἐκαμψαν) y no con la lectura del resto de la LXX (ὠκλασαν).

⁽¹¹⁾ FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 113.

⁽¹²⁾ E. HATCH-H. A. REDPATH, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* (Oxford 1897). Esta concordancia sólo recoge la referencia de 1 Re 1,33 en este capítulo, pues como es bien sabido, el texto luciánico — con un léxico tan distinto en los libros históricos del de la mayoría de LXX — no está recogido en dicha concordancia. Josefo, escritor más o menos contemporáneo de Lucas y con muchos elementos semejantes al evangelista en cuanto a su uso del AT, utiliza en este caso ἀναβιβάζειν (cf. *Ant.* 7, 355 y 357).

busca de la caballería (v.30) y la «resistencia a subirse» que pone de manifiesto el uso del verbo ἐπιβιβάζειν, causal de ἐπιβαίνειν, paradoja que provocó una pequeña polémica allá por los años treinta⁽¹³⁾. En efecto, Lucas utiliza este mismo verbo en otras dos ocasiones a lo largo de su evangelio y Hechos. En la primera se refiere al buen samaritano que *carga* en su propia cabalgadura («cargándole en su propia cabalgadura» ἐπιβίβασας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον κτῆνος Lc 10,34) a un hombre que no puede valerle por sí mismo, ya que los bandidos le habían dejado medio muerto (ἡμιθανῆ Lc 10,30); la segunda, figura en una orden del tribuno a dos centuriones para que hagan montar a Pablo en cabalgaduras y lo lleven sano y salvo, pero preso, al procurador Félix en Cesarea (“preparasen caballerías para que haciendo montar a Pablo lo llevaran sano al procurador Félix”, κτήνη τε παραστήσαι, ἵνα ἐπιβίβασαντες τὸν Παῦλον διασώσωσι πρὸς Φήλικα τὸν ἡγεμόνα Act 23,24). En ambas ocasiones se emplea, pues, para situaciones en las que los que suben a la caballería no pueden actuar por sí mismos.

Volviendo al episodio de la entrada en Jerusalén, ¿fue la multitud la que obligó a Jesús a actuar así en contra de su voluntad, ya que este desfile triunfal lesionaba su concepción del mesianismo?, se pregunta Davies⁽¹⁴⁾; o ¿este verbo hace más bien referencia a un amistoso forcejeo de los discípulos que al verle cansado le obligan a subir a la cabalgadura?⁽¹⁵⁾. Y en ambos casos, si Jesús no deseaba este tipo de entrada triunfal, ¿por qué envió por delante a dos discípulos en busca de la caballería?... Las especulaciones por estos derroteros nada aprovechan para la comprensión del pasaje. Y, a mi entender, la clave de esta pequeña incoherencia literaria reside en que Lucas incorpora como uno de los elementos *redaccionales* en la segunda parte de esta perícopa el de la imitación del episodio que describe la unción repentina del joven Salomón y la procesión de entronización que le sigue⁽¹⁶⁾.

B. Otros puntos de contacto

Como acabamos de ver, el uso que hace Lucas del verbo ἐπιβιβάζειν en el contexto de la llegada de Jesús a Jerusalén tiene suficiente poder evocador para un lector de Septuaginta, como para trasladarle al episodio de la unción de Salomón y la procesión triunfal con aclamación del pueblo. Pero hay además en la redacción de Lucas otros indicios que apuntan en la misma dirección, aunque no todos tengan la misma fuerza ni sean tan decisivos como el que hemos indicando, para establecer una conexión literaria. Insisto, Lucas construye su relato con el bloque del material tomado de Marcos y con ele-

⁽¹³⁾ T. L. DAVIES, «Was Jesus Compelled?», *ExpTim* 42 (1930-1931) 526-527; R. S. FRAYN, «Was Jesus Compelled?», *ExpTim* 43 (1931-1932) 381-382 y J. MEIKLE, «Was Jesus Compelled?», *ExpTim* 43 (1931-1932) 288.

⁽¹⁴⁾ DAVIES, «Was Jesus Compelled?», 527.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Así FRAYN, «Was Jesus Compelled?», 381.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Con independencia del núcleo histórico del relato se puede afirmar que en Lucas este pasaje está entretejido con elementos literarios del episodio al que estamos aludiendo.

mentos redaccionales propios de su evangelio, como pueden ser, en nuestro caso, la insistencia en el marco geográfico (v.37). Pero otra parte de sus rasgos peculiares encuentra una explicación si utilizamos como trasfondo literario la procesión de entronización de Salomón tal como se describe concretamente en el texto antioqueno de la Septuaginta.

En primer lugar, en la misma inserción de ὁ βασιλεὺς en la cita del salmo 118,26 — que es redaccional, puesto que en 13,35 cita el mismo verso literalmente — está resonando la aclamación del pueblo Ζήτω Σολομών ὁ βασιλεὺς (1 Re 1,39). Y en la descripción del desfile de entronización que seguía al rito de la unción, encuentro semejanzas limitadas, pero significativas, con la descripción procesional de Lucas. Obviamente estos engarces están adaptados al plan editorial de su evangelio (marco geográfico v.37a) y Lucas mantiene el uso de sus palabras favoritas tales como πλήθος y αἰνεῖν. Veamos en paralelo estas equivalencias que revelan un interés en Lucas por imitar el esquema literario de la entronización de Salomón:

1 Re 1,40 (LXX Ant.)

Lc 19,37

καὶ ἀνέβη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ	ἤρξαντο ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν
καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς... ἔχαιρον	χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν θεὸν
χαρᾷ μεγάλῃ,	
καὶ ἤχησεν ἡ γῆ ἐν τῇ φωνῇ αὐτῶν	φωνῇ μεγάλῃ...

Sabido es que la fraseología de Lucas es más económica que la de LXX, es decir, que Lucas abrevia y rezuma el vocabulario del AT griego. Pues bien, los rasgos redaccionales antes señalados faltan en los otros sinópticos. Lucas enfatiza la manifestación pública de la multitud aludiendo con la expresión φωνῇ μεγάλῃ a una emoción excepcionalmente intensa, como puede comprobarse por las otras contadas ocasiones en que dicha expresión aparece en su evangelio⁽¹⁷⁾. Esta expresión es un eco de la del texto antioqueno («retumbó la tierra con su voz», ἤχησεν ἡ γῆ ἐν τῇ φωνῇ αὐτῶν) menos hiperbólica que la de LXX *rell* (“se rasgó la tierra con su voz”, ἐρράγη ἡ γῆ ἐν τῇ φωνῇ αὐτῶν).

Hay además otras transformaciones que evocan el pasaje de Septuaginta al que estamos aludiendo. Lucas es el único evangelista que omite el gesto de los discípulos de cortar ramas de los campos (Mc 11,8), con lo que la referencia a la entronización real queda más clarificada, concentrándose en la acción de extender los mantos en el camino como gesto de homenaje específicamente mencionado en la coronación de Jehú (2 Re 9,13)⁽¹⁸⁾. Tanto la re-

⁽¹⁷⁾ Cf. Ch. H. GIBLIN, *The Destruction of Jerusalem According to Luke's Gospel* (AnBib 107; Roma 1985) 51: «The phrase φωνῇ μεγάλῃ suggests exceptionally strong human emotion».

⁽¹⁸⁾ GIBLIN, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, 50. Después de haber detectado la relación literaria entre los pasajes que comento, he comprobado con satisfacción cómo Giblin ha percibido también una alusión al desfile de entronización de

petición de la debatida frase de Mc 11,3: («su dueño lo necesita», ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρειαν ἔχει) en los vv.31 y 34 de Lucas como la sustitución del τινὲς τῶν ἐκεῖ ἐστηκότων de Mc 11,4 por οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ, los dueños del animal (Lc 19,33), están dejando en claro quién es el verdadero dueño de la caballería⁽¹⁹⁾. Y me pregunto si no estará aludiendo a la expresión τὴν ἡμίονον τὴν ἐμήν (1 Re 1,33), el gesto de montar la propia mula del rey David como privilegio que simboliza la realeza, ya que la marca de propiedad sobre los animales era una prerrogativa real⁽²⁰⁾.

Consecuente con su tendencia a suprimir las palabras hebreas o arameas de sus fuentes, Lc omite por dos veces la exclamación ὡσαννά de Mc 11,9-10 y en cambio escribe ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνην/καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις (v.38), que evoca hasta en la misma construcción quiástica el himno de Lc 2,14, aunque bastante transformado en cuanto al contenido. Los motivos de este cambio no aparecen del todo claros⁽²¹⁾, pero completan la imagen del mesías, rey pacificador que entra en la ciudad. Y me pregunto si no habrá en la expresión lucana εἰρήνην καὶ δόξα una alusión velada a Salomón cuya etimología popular, «el pacificador», ya conoce el libro primero de las Crónicas⁽²²⁾,

Salomón a través del uso de ἐπιβιάζειν por parte de Lc. Giblin cita (p. 50) 1 Re 1,33, el único versículo de este capítulo en que aparece dicho verbo en LXX. Creo que la conexión literaria que propongo con el ritual mismo de la unción (v.38) a través del texto antioqueno, y no con la orden del rey David (v.33) es más verosímil y convincente. La alusión a la coronación de Jehú no resta valor a mi argumentación. En efecto, tenemos otros ejemplos de imitación de LXX por parte de Lucas, como es el caso de la lapidación de Esteban, en el que la historia de Nabot se adapta al nuevo relato mezclándola con episodios de Jesús y Pablo, cf. T. L. BRODIE, «The Accusing and Stoning of Naboth (1 Kgs 21:8-23) as One Component of the Stephen Text (Acts 6:9-14; 7:58a)», *CBQ* 45 (1983) 417-32, 431.

⁽¹⁹⁾ GIBLIN, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, 50: «Even the ass's owners were so described to set in relief Jesus' being the real owner».

⁽²⁰⁾ GIBLIN, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, 49. En cambio el nombre del animal, πῶλον δεδεμένον, y el motivo «que nadie había montado antes» (ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισε) parecen tomados de Marcos sin mayor reflexión ni otras modificaciones que las estrictamente estilísticas. El animal que no ha conocido el yugo ni ha sido antes usado por nadie, es un motivo frecuente en el AT como requisito ritual, cf. FITZMYER, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1249.

⁽²¹⁾ Según A. PLUMMER, *The Gospel According to S. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh 1981) 448. «Lk. substitutes δόξα (more intelligible to Gentiles) for the Hosanna of the other three... The words ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνην are in Lk. alone, and are perhaps part of his paraphrase of Hosanna». Cf. también FITZMYER, *Luke X-XXIX*, 1251: «It is not just the real *pax Augusta*, which the birth of Jesus brought to humanity, but the peace of heaven itself».

⁽²²⁾ Cf. 1 Cr 22,9: «Mira te ha nacido un hijo que será un hombre de paz. Tendrá paz con todos los enemigos que le rodean, porque Salomón es su nombre y concederé paz y tranquilidad sobre Israel en los días de su reinado» (ἰδοὺ υἱὸς τίκτεται σοι, οὗτος ἔσται ἀνὴρ ἀναπαύσεως, καὶ ἀναπαύσω αὐτὸν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν κυκλόθεν, ὅτι Σαλωμὼν ὄνομα αὐτῷ καὶ εἰρήνην καὶ ἡσυχίαν δώσω ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ).

La traducción de LXX no retiene el inequívoco juego de palabras del original hebreo... שלום שמו יהיה שמו של, pero la etimología popular de Salomón la conocían también los que ignoraban el hebreo como demuestran los *Onomastica Sacra*, cf. N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, «Nombres propios y etimologías populares en la Septuaginta», *Sef* 37 (1977) 239-259.

sobre todo cuando se han detectado en Lucas otros ejemplos de posibles juegos de palabras sobre textos del AT⁽²³⁾.

Finalmente la unción por sorpresa de Salomón está provocada, en el marco del relato en torno a la sucesión de David, por la insurrección de Adonías (Ornías en el texto antioqueno) que ha usurpado el trono. También en Lucas, en la parábola de las minas que precede a la entrada en Jerusalén, están muy presentes unos enemigos que no quieren aceptar al rey de la parábola. Aunque no sea preciso establecer una equivalencia completa entre la parábola de Lc 19,11-27 y los acontecimientos que le siguen, lo cierto es que dicha parábola es una descripción anticipada de lo que le va a ocurrir a Jesús. Pues bien, Lucas presenta en dicha parábola como material específico suyo⁽²⁴⁾ a unos fieles servidores del rey frente a unos ciudadanos que lo odian y que no quieren que reine sobre ellos (Lc 19,14.27)⁽²⁵⁾. Igualmente Jesús será reconocido como rey por sus discípulos que lo acompañan, pero no por los fariseos ni por los ciudadanos de Jerusalén que más tarde se comprobará que no comparten la opinión de los discípulos⁽²⁶⁾.

Frente a Saúl ungido en Gilgal (1 Sam 10,1) y David en Hebrón (2 Sam 5,3), Salomón es el único rey ungido en Jerusalén como rey de Israel y de Judá⁽²⁷⁾. Hay pues motivos para describir como nuevo Salomón a Jesús entrando en Jerusalén y cumpliendo así la profecía anunciada en el pórtico mismo del evangelio de Lucas: «Y el Señor Dios le dará el trono de David su padre y reinará sobre la casa de Jacob»⁽²⁸⁾. Se puede afirmar, por tanto, que el episodio de la unción y entronización de Salomón es *uno* de los componentes literarios que han influido en la redacción lucana de la entrada de Jesús en Jerusalén. Y es posible que la fuente escrita concreta en la que se ha inspirado Lucas para la elaboración de esta perícopa, sea la del texto antioqueno de Septuaginta en 1 Re 1,33-40.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. T. L. BRODIE, «Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation», *Bib* 64 (1983) 457-485, 473 y id., «Towards Unraveling the Rhetorical Imitation of Sources in Acts: 2 Kgs 5 as One Component of Acts 8,9-40», *Bib* 67 (1986) 41-67, 49. Si bien a primera vista estas alusiones literarias de Lucas pueden parecer excesivamente sofisticadas, hay que tener en cuenta que a Lucas se le ha definido como un consumado artista literario, cf. FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 92.

⁽²⁴⁾ No entramos ahora en si es parábola distinta de la de los talentos (Mt 25,14-30). Sí me parece en cambio interesante, el motivo de la parábola: «por estar él cerca de Jerusalén y parecerles que el reino de Dios iba a aparecer al momento» (διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς εἶναι Ἱερουσαλὴμ αὐτὸν καὶ δοκεῖν αὐτοὺς ὅτι παρὰ ῥῆμα μέλλει ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναφαίνεσθαι, Lc 19,11).

⁽²⁵⁾ Lc 19,14: «No queremos que éste reine sobre nosotros» (οὐ θέλομεν τοῦτον βασιλεῦσαι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς) y Lc 19,27: «Pero a esos enemigos míos que no quisieron que reinara...» (πλὴν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς μου τούτους τοὺς μὴ θελήσαντάς με βασιλεῦσαι...).

⁽²⁶⁾ Lc 19,39-40, cf. GIBLIN, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, 48.

⁽²⁷⁾ Cf. 1 Re 1,35: «Se sentará sobre mi trono y reinará en mi lugar, pues he ordenado que gobierne sobre Israel y Judá» (καὶ καθήσεται ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου μου καὶ βασιλεύσει ἀντ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐντετεύλαμην τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἡγουμένον ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδᾶ).

⁽²⁸⁾ Lc 1,32-33: καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ.

Naturalmente que hay también diferencias, explicables unas por el material heredado de Marcos, y otras por la necesidad de adaptación al momento histórico o cristianización del pasaje y a la estructura propia de su evangelio. Por eso no es el único elemento literario que ha de tenerse en cuenta. Pero no me voy a detener en dichas diferencias como tampoco en la naturaleza del animal que cabalgó Jesús, si fue potro o pollino, por recordarme demasiado el conocido aforismo de la lengua castellana «si son galgos o son podencos» para designar una discusión bizantina que entretiene y desvía del objetivo fundamental de la caza o busca⁽²⁹⁾.

Admito que esta confluencia de indicios últimamente apuntados tienen menos fuerza que el argumento antes avanzado sobre el uso del verbo ἐπιβάς. Es más, yo mismo me sentiría inclinado a mover la cabeza dubitativo, si recientemente no se estuviera descifrando una técnica típicamente lucana en el uso de la Escritura, como es el procedimiento de la imitación de las fuentes, muy usado por los historiadores helenísticos. Hace unos años señalaba bajo el epígrafe «Otras áreas de influencia», un uso más sutil de la Septuaginta por parte de los autores del Nuevo Testamento — además de la citas formales del AT —. En efecto, comenzaba a descubrirse cómo perícopas enteras estaban construidas sobre el modelo literario de un pasaje semejante del AT, gracias al poder evocador de una palabra clave de la Septuaginta⁽³⁰⁾. Pues bien, este fenómeno de imitación literaria que afecta también a otros evangelistas⁽³¹⁾ se ha puesto de manifiesto particularmente en Lucas, hasta el punto de que su método de narrar la historia de Jesús ha podido ser calificado de la manera más adecuada como de «historiografía imitativa»⁽³²⁾. El

⁽²⁹⁾ W. BAUER, «The 'Colt' of Palm Sunday (Der Palmesel)», *JBL* 72 (1953) 220-229, mantiene que cuando πῶλος = "animal joven" va solo, no determinado por el nombre de otro animal, tiende a significar siempre 'caballo joven' y así lo ha mantenido en su quinta edición del diccionario del Nuevo Testamento. Por el contrario H.-W. KUHN, «Das Reittier Jesu in der Einzugs geschichte des Markus-evangeliums», *ZNW* 50 (1959) 82-91, defiende un uso específicamente cristiano de πῶλος con el sentido de "pollino", mientras que O. MICHEL, «Eine philologische Frage zur Einzugs geschichte», *NTS* 6 (1960) 81-82, asegura que este sentido de "pollino o asno joven" para πῶλος está suficientemente garantizado y atestiguado ya en la traducción de Septuaginta. Ciertamente este último significado está avalado por la tradición cristiana en continuidad con la lengua de LXX, como puede comprobarse consultando πῶλος en G. W. H. LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1968) 1213-1214.

⁽³⁰⁾ N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia* (Madrid 1979) 321: «La historia de la redacción de más de una perícopa neotestamentaria se desvela por este método pivotando en torno a una palabra clave de LXX».

⁽³¹⁾ Cf. J. L. MESA, «Oseas y la higuera y el templo de Marcos (Mc 11,12-25 y Os 9,10-17)» *Palabra y Vida. Homenaje a José Alonso Díaz en su 70 cumpleaños* (ed. A. VARGAS-MACHUCA y G. RUIZ) (Madrid 1984) 153-159.

⁽³²⁾ Término acuñado por E. Burrows en 1940 y usado con un sentido ligeramente matizado por FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 309. Ha sido aceptado también por GIBLIN, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, 8, y sobre todo por T. L. BRODIE, «Towards Unravelling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7.11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17.17-24», *NTS* 32 (1986) 247-267. Este último autor (p. 263), siguiendo a Fitzmyer, indica que dicha expresión es más adecuada que el término midrás para describir el uso que hace Lucas del AT cuando no se trata de citas formales.

uso literario que hace Lucas del AT griego sin mencionarlo, está más cerca de la práctica retórica de la *imitatio* que invadió la educación del mundo helenístico en el s. I d. C., que del midrás, como ha puesto de relieve Fitzmyer, y sobre todo Brodie, en sus numerosas publicaciones sobre el tema⁽³³⁾. Éstas ponen al descubierto el proceso de interiorización, adaptación histórica y cristianización de los relatos del AT que utiliza Lucas como modelos literarios. Está comprobado que Lucas hace un uso variado pero intenso de la Septuaginta para resaltar una de las preocupaciones fundamentales de su evangelio: mostrar la conexión y continuidad entre el judaísmo y el cristianismo⁽³⁴⁾. Y en concreto, se ha constatado que los libros de Samuel-Reyes son una de las principales fuentes de inspiración de Lucas para su obra evangelio-Hechos, y hasta el momento se han detectado dentro de estos libros la imitación literaria del oráculo dinástico del profeta Natán, de varias historias de Elías y Eliseo, en particular la resurrección del hijo de la viuda y la sunamita de Sareftah, la lapidación de Nabot, el relato de curación de Naamán el Sirio⁽³⁵⁾. Precisamente concluía Brodie uno de sus últimos artículos sobre el tema con las siguientes palabras: «It remains to be seen to what extent Luke's use of 1 Kgs 17.17-24 represents the tip of an iceberg. Hellenistic authors did not usually confine themselves to imitating isolating passages⁽³⁶⁾».

Mi artículo ha querido ser una pequeña contribución en esta dirección, convencido del acierto básico de esta línea de investigación. He intentado mostrar para el episodio de la entrada en Jerusalén algo que ya habían advertido Fitzmyer y Brodie para otros relatos del evangelio de Lucas⁽³⁷⁾: que sea lo que fuere de la realidad histórica de la llegada de Jesús a Jerusalén, en Lucas la descripción de ese acontecimiento ha sido asimilada a la procesión de entronización que siguió a la unción del joven Salomón. Asimismo pienso, que ha quedado en claro otro hecho importante: que la comparación de la obra literaria de Lucas con pasajes similares del AT griego, contribuye en ocasiones a iluminar y comprender mejor la historia de la redacción que la comparación con los relatos paralelos de los otros evangelistas.

Dpto. de Filología Bíblica
y de Oriente Antiguo
Instituto de Filología. C.S.I.C.
Duque de Medinaceli, 6
28014 Madrid

Natalio FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS

⁽³³⁾ Cf. artículos de Brodie citados en notas 18, 23 y 32.

⁽³⁴⁾ FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 5: «This concern of Luke to stress the connection and the continuation between Judaism and Christianity is seen clearly in his use of the OT to interpret the Christ-event».

⁽³⁵⁾ FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 338 y los artículos de Brodie antes mencionados.

⁽³⁶⁾ BRODIE, «Towards Unravelling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7.11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17.17-24», 263.

⁽³⁷⁾ FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 309, refiriéndose a las narraciones de la infancia en Mt y Lc: «Whatever historical matter has been preserved by the two evangelists has been assimilated by them to other literary accounts, either biblical or extra-biblical»; y BRODIE, «Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37», 483.

Three Bulls or One?: A Reappraisal of 1 Samuel 1,24*

For Matitiah Tsevat

²⁴ And when she had weaned him, she took him up with her, along with a three-year-old bull, *an ephah of flour, and a skin of wine; and she brought him to the house of the Lord... ²⁵ Then they slew the bull and they brought the child to Eli.

* Gk Syr: Heb *three bulls* (NOAB)

Since the time of O. Thenius, one of the certainties of modern textual criticism has been the emended reading of 1 Sam 1,24, *b'par mēšullāš* in place of the MT's *b'pārīm š'lōšā*⁽¹⁾. This reading has been accepted without question in nearly all modern commentaries on the books of Samuel as well as in lexica and treatises on textual criticism⁽²⁾. In part, the argument in favor of this emendation is based upon evidence from Genesis 15. This pivotal chapter, in fact, also provides evidence to both refute the necessity for emendation and lend support to the reading of the MT.

The following points have led to this unanimous agreement. First, there appears to be a contradiction between verses 24 and 25 of the MT. In verse

* Thanks are tendered to my colleague, Bruce Zuckerman, for his advice and bibliographic assistance.

(1) O. THENIUS, *Die Bücher Samuels erklärt* (Leipzig 1864) 8.

(2) Among those who have accepted this emendation are J. WELLHAUSEN, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht* (Göttingen 1871) 41; S. R. DRIVER, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford 1890) 20; H. P. SMITH, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh 1899) 14; K. BUDDE, *Die Bücher Samuel erklärt* (KHCAT VIII; Tübingen and Leipzig 1902) 12; BDB, 830, col. b, 2., a.; P. DHORME, *Les Livres de Samuel* (Paris 1910) 24; E. A. SPEISER, "The Nuzi Tablets Solve a Puzzle in the Books of Samuel", *BASOR* 72 (1938) 15-17; F. M. CROSS, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint", *BASOR* 132 (1953) 15-26, especially p. 19; M. SEGAL, *The Books of Samuel* (Jerusalem 1964) 13-14 (in Hebrew); H. J. STOEBE, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT VIII/1; Gütersloh 1973) 98-99; R. PÉTER, "Par et Šör: Note de lexicographie hébraïque", *VT* 25 (1975) 486-496, especially p. 491 and note 8; P. K. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel* (AB VIII; Garden City 1980) 56-57; E. TOV, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem 1981) 176 f.; HALAT, vol. 3 (1983) 905, col. a. [Hereafter these works will be referred to by author.]

24, *pārīm š'lošā*, "three bulls", are mentioned, but verse 25 says that they slaughtered *happār*, 'the bull'. Second, a syntactical anomaly appears in verse 24. The word order 1) *substantive* 2) *numeral* is unusual, though it does appear (albeit mostly in late texts) in BH. Third, the LXX (*en moschō trietizonti*), Peshitta (*betūrā tūltā*) and 4QSam^a ([*bpr bn*] *bqr mšlš*⁽³⁾) all support the reading *b'par m'sullāš*, 'with a three-year-old bull'. This reading resolves the contradiction between verses 24 and 25, and alleviates the unusual numeral syntax. In addition, the sacrificial practice described here conforms well to that found in Gen 15,9: "Take for me a three-year-old heifer ('*eglā m'sullešet*'), a three-year-old goat ('*ēz m'sullešet*'), a three-year-old ram ('*ayil m'sullāš*'), a turtledove, and a young pigeon"⁽⁴⁾. Taken together, these three pieces of evidence have been sufficient to render the MT's reading doubtful, if not discountable.

How did the MT's reading come about? It is conjectured that the author of this story intended the words *b'par m'sullāš*, 'with a three-year-old bull'. A copyist, working from a manuscript written in *scriptio continua*, made an incorrect word division. The letters he saw were *bpr mšlš*, which he copied as *b'pārīm š'lošā*. (We note this reconstruction assumes that the vowel letters *yod*, in the first word, and *hey*, in the second word, were not present⁽⁵⁾, nor did the *mem* have the special final form in the manuscript from which this scribe worked; these developments would have occurred later.) In this way, the copyist introduced a contradiction into the text. By contrast, the translators of the LXX and the Peshitta and the scribe of 4QSam^a understood the text "correctly".

This study assumes that the fundamental guide in all text-critical analysis is context. E. Tov states:

The criterion most pertinent to the evaluation of variant readings is the appropriateness of the reading in the context. . . . It applies to near and remote contexts and includes both the content and the language of the biblical text⁽⁶⁾.

What follows is an investigation of one context which has been virtually ignored in previous text-critical studies of 1 Sam 1,24, namely that of biblical

⁽³⁾ Cf. CROSS, especially, the plate of 4QSam^a (col. I, line 7) on page 17, and his comments on page 19 and note 8 there. E. C. ULRICH discusses the reading in *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (Missoula 1978) 49 as does MCCARTER, *ibid*.

⁽⁴⁾ The forms *m'sullāš* and *m'sullešet* occur only here in the Bible with the meaning 'three-year-old'. There is even some dispute whether these adjectives mean 'three-year-old' at all; cf. PÉTER, *ibid*.

⁽⁵⁾ The argument concerning the presence or nonpresence of *matres lectionis* in the early manuscripts from which the ancient scribes worked is unfortunately circular. We only know that these were or were not present from the reconstructions of text critics which attempt to explain the differences between various versions of the biblical text. After collecting several cases where reconstructions seem to indicate that the manuscript(s) had or lacked vowel letters, it is posited that there were or were no vowel letters; cf. Tov, 206-207.

⁽⁶⁾ Tov, 288, 289.

Hebrew grammar. To this end, we will examine the three above mentioned points inside out, beginning with the second. Is the syntactical formation found in verse 24, in fact, difficult or anomalous?

It has already been noted that the numeral syntax presented in the MT is found elsewhere in BH, mostly, but not exclusively, in late texts. For this reason, S. R. Driver, for instance, cautions against reliance upon the unusual character of this formation as an indication of the faultiness of the MT⁽⁷⁾. There are enough examples of this word order in BH generally to support the present usage⁽⁸⁾.

In particular, this usage is attested three more times in Samuel itself, yet these occurrences have escaped notice⁽⁹⁾. 1 Sam 25,2 presents a contrastive pair within the same verse: *š' ōn š'elōšet 'alāpīm w'e'elep 'izzīm*: "[He (Nabal) had] three thousand sheep and a thousand goats". Here, the unusual word order precedes the usual. In 2 Sam 1,1, we read: "David dwelt in Ziklag for two days". The words, 'two days', render Hebrew *yāmīm š'nayīm* — the numeral follows. In 2 Sam 24,24, David purchases the threshing floor *b'kesep š'qālīm ḥamišīm*, 'with fifty pieces of silver' (contrast 1 Sam 17,5; 2 Sam 21,16). If the formation in 1 Sam 1,24, *pārīm š'elōšā*, was an acceptable alternative for the writer to have selected, there is no necessary reason to emend the text.

(7) DRIVER, 20, n. 1.

(8) S. HERNER, *Syntax der Zahlwörter im Alten Testament* (Lund 1893) 53 ff. gives an exhaustive list of all occurrences of the numeral both before and after the substantive; cf., also, GKC², section 134; E. KÖNIG, *Syntax der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig 1897), section 312c-f and his "Zur Syntax der Zahlwörter im Alten Testament", *AJSL* 18 (1901) 129-148.

G. Rendsburg, in his review of R. POLZIN's *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (Missoula 1976), is correct in noting that the only relevant passages are those that are not part of lists ("Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of 'P'", *JANES* 12 (1980) 65-80, especially p. 71). In such lists (e.g., Gen 32,15-16; 42; Exod 27; 38; Num 7; 28; 29; 31,32 ff.; Josh 12; 15; 18; 19; 21; Ezek 48,31 ff.; Ezra 1,9-11; 2,65 ff.; 8,18 ff.; Neh 7; 1 Chr 6,46-48; 26,9 ff.; 2 Chr 3 and 4 [but note the contrasts in 1 Kgs 5-7]; 35,7 ff.; there are also several short lists of a single verse), the numeral would be expected to follow the substantive.

Perhaps we should understand 1 Sam 1,24 as a list. If so, we should note the contrastive usage in 1 Sam 10,3. If not, other comparable passages include: Gen 42,3; Exod 29,1.38; 36,17.31; Lev 23,18 (note the contrast within the verse); 1 Kgs 8,63; Dan 1,12.14.15; 9,25-26; Ezra 8,15.32.35; Neh 2,11; 5,15.18; 1 Chr 4,42; 12,39; 22,14 (note the contrast within the verse); 25,5; 2 Chr 1,6; 11,17(2x).21(2x; note the contrast within the verse); 13,9.21 (note the contrast within the verse); 20,25; 21,19; 24,3; 29,17.

A relatively large number of these examples (both inside and outside the lists) occurs in texts describing and prescribing cultic acts and offerings. Seen in this light, the author's choice of word order in 1 Sam 1,24 makes perfect sense.

(9) There are 143 relevant usages of cardinal numbers, above the number one, in the books of Samuel. Excluded are those in which no explicit statement of the thing or unit being counted is given; cf. 1 Sam 2,5; 13,2.3; 15,4; 25,13; 2 Sam 2,15; 18,3.7; 21,20.21. In addition, 1 Sam 11,8 is excluded (but contrast 1 Chronicles 21,5); cf. above, note 8, concerning lists. The four instances where the numeral follows the substantive represent 2.7 percent of the cardinal numeral usages in Samuel.

We turn now to the first point, noted above, which is by far the most compelling. If the MT is correct, three bulls appear in verse 24, whereas only one is described in verse 25. All previous attempts⁽¹⁰⁾ to solve this problem have relied upon the obvious meaning of *happār*, 'the bull', that is, a single bull. However, there is another way to understand this word that would allow for the presence of three bulls in verse 24 and have them all sacrificed in verse 25. *happār* is a collective and is to be rendered in this context as "the bulls". This interpretation finds support in Gen 15,10.

After God commands Abram to take the three three-year-old animals, a turtledove, and a young pigeon, Abram sacrifices the animals: "He split them in the middle and placed the pieces opposite one another; but he did not split *the birds*". In the context, the antecedent to the word *haššippōr* (normally to be rendered 'the bird') is undisputedly plural. The reading of the word *haššippōr* is also undisputed. *haššippōr* is morphologically definite and singular, but collective in signification.

The same usage is found again in the books of Samuel, in 2 Sam 6,18 (cf. 1 Chr 16,1 and 2). We learn in 2 Sam 6,17 that "David offered up burnt offerings ('*ōlōt*) and peace offerings before the Lord". Then in verse 18, "When David finished offering up the burnt offerings (*hā'ōlā*) and peace offerings, he blessed the people in the name of the Lord of Hosts". Here, again, an indefinite plural ('*ōlōt*) is followed by a definite collective (*hā'ōlā*)⁽¹¹⁾.

If the word *happār* of 1 Sam 1,25 is a collective and the syntactic formation *pārīm šelōšā* is perfectly acceptable, then the MT of 1 Sam 1,24-5 (at a minimum, with regard to the animals involved) stands firmly on its own. 1 Sam 1,24-25 should now be translated:

24 And she brought him with her when she had weaned him, along with three bulls, one ephah of flour, and a skin of wine. . . .²⁵ Then they slaughtered the bulls and brought the boy to Eli.

There is no reason internal to the text, be it contextual or grammatical, that calls the MT into question. The MT no longer needs to be explained. Perhaps the versions do.

How did the versions arrive at the reading *par m'sullāš*? This problem can never be resolved with certainty. One might suggest that the LXX and Peshitta translators and the 4QSam^a scribe were all baffled by the apparent contradiction between verses 24 and 25 with regard to the number of animals involved in the sacrifice. When faced with the decision how to divide the

⁽¹⁰⁾ This may include the ancient scribes responsible for the versions under discussion here; see below.

⁽¹¹⁾ 1 Sam 6,7 contrasts strikingly with 1 Sam 1,24.

Other examples of the collective usage are: Num 21,6.7; Num 23,1-2.(14).29-30 (thanks to M. Tsevat for this reference in a private communication of August 11, 1986); 2 Kgs 10,24.25; Ezek 45,23.24 (both *par* and '*ayil*'); 2 Chr 29,31.32. Again (see note 8, above), these usages relate to cultic situations as does 1 Sam 1,24. Of note, also, is the collective meaning of the singular pronominal suffix-*ēhū* in reference to *šemed bāqār* in 1 Sam 11,7 (contrast 2 Sam 16,1).

letters *prmšlš* into discrete words, these ancient interpreters, relying upon their knowledge of Gen 15,9, *independently* found a way to alleviate the contradiction altogether. A more reasonable explanation is that this innovative interpretation and reading goes back to the scribe responsible for the *Vorlage* underlying the LXX and 4QSam^a. The Peshitta's reading may have arisen independently⁽¹²⁾. In any event, if this scenario is correct, the versions introduced a simplification and harmonization into their texts.

Had only modern text critics looked ahead one verse to Gen 15,10, they might have realized that the sparing of two birds makes possible the sacrifice of three bulls.

176 Cedarbrook Dr.
Loveland, Ohio 45140
U.S.A.

Robert RATNER

⁽¹²⁾ Tov, 260.

A Note on Psalm 4,5

The text of Ps 4,5 and the NAB translation are as follows:

Rigzû wě'al tehětā'û
'imrû bilbabkem 'al miškabkem wědōmmû
 Tremble, and sin not;
 reflect, upon your beds, in silence⁽¹⁾.

Attempts at clarifying this passage by rearrangement of its parts have been proposed by a number of commentators⁽²⁾; but these adjustments have not won wide agreement. The thesis of this note is that all the elements for a better understanding of Ps 4,5 (without rearrangement) are already available, in a number of independent suggestions. Since these suggestions have not previously been brought together, the sense of Ps 4,5 has remained obscure and elusive. Our intent here is to bring together and adapt these several suggestions and thereby to illumine the text under discussion.

We can begin with *wdmw*, commonly translated as "Be silent!" In a number of studies, Dahood proposed another possibility; on the basis of Akkadian and Ugaritic cognates⁽³⁾. Dahood analyzed the form as derived not from *dmm* I ("be dumb, silent, still"), but from *dmm* II ("weep, lament, wail")⁽⁴⁾. The existence in Hebrew of *dmm* II, cautiously advanced by BDB as a possibility for Isa 23,2⁽⁵⁾, has been accepted by the most recent Hebrew dictionary and by a number of scholars⁽⁶⁾. Accepting this proposal for the

⁽¹⁾ Apart from suggesting a different nuance for *rgzw*, RSV translates similarly, if more literally: "Be angry, but sin not; commune with your own hearts on your beds, and be silent".

⁽²⁾ See for instance H. Bardtke in the *BHS* apparatus; H. GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen* (Göttingen 1968 [reprint]) 17; H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalmen 1* (BKAT 15/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968) 30-31.

⁽³⁾ V. AVISHUR, *Stylistic Studies of Word-Pairs in Biblical and Ancient Semitic Languages* (AOAT 210; Kevelaer-Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984) 529-530 (on Akkadian *bakû* // *damāmu*, Ugaritic *bky* // *dmm*).

⁽⁴⁾ M. DAHOOD, "Textual Problems in Isaia", *CBQ* 22 (1960) 400-403; "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography II", *Bib* 45 (1964) 402-403; *Psalms I* (AB 16; Garden City, NY 1966) 24-25. Other possible instances of *dmm* II include Isa 23,2, 38,10; Jer 8,14; Pss 9,13; 31,18; 51,16; Lam 2,10; Sir 9,9.

⁽⁵⁾ F. BROWN, S. R. DRIVER, and C. A. BRIGGS, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1966 [corrected impression]) 199.

⁽⁶⁾ W. BAUMGARTNER (ed.), *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament I* (Leiden 1967) 217; D. HILLERS, *Lamentations* (AB 7A; Garden City, NY 1972) 38 (commenting on Lam 2,10); T. F. McDANIEL, "Philological Studies on Lamentations I", *Bib* 49 (1968) 38-40. For some doubt on Hebrew *dmm* II

meaning of *dmm* and taking the initial *waw* as emphatic one can render 'l *mškbkm wdmw* as "upon your beds weep copiously/wail aloud"(7).

This analysis of *wdmw* receives support from a reconsideration of the phrase '*mrw blbbkm*. To be sure, this expression, meaning "to speak in one's heart, to think", is a common one(8) and is the basis of the translation in NAB ("reflect")(9). However, what this expression would mean in context is unclear, as the various attempts at understanding in the commentaries suggest. In light of this, several emendations of '*mrw* have been suggested, the most likely being the change of '*mrw* to *hāmērū* ("show bitterness", a hiphil from the root *mrr*), for a translation "Be embittered in your hearts, upon your beds, but be silent"(10). Accepting the suggestion that underlying '*mrw* is a form derived from *mrr*, I would propose a simpler emendation to nominal *mar* ("bitterness"). The clue for this emendation is the regular association of *mr* with verbs of crying out or weeping, where it functions adverbially:

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| Isa 33,7 | <i>hn 'r'lm š'qw ḥsh</i>
<i>ml'ky šlwm mr ybkywn</i>
Behold the Arielites(?) cry out in the streets;
the messengers of peace (or "Shalem"?) weep bitterly. |
| Ezek 27,30-31 | <i>wyz'qw mrh...</i>
<i>wbkw 'lyk bmr npš mspd mr</i>
They cry out bitterly...;
they weep over you with bitterness of spirit, with bitter lament(11). |
| Jer 31,15 | <i>qwl brmh nšm' nhy</i>
<i>bky tmrwrym</i>
A sound is heard in Ramah — lamentation, bitter weeping(12). |

Now if Dahood and others have correctly understood *wdmw* as referring to lament or weeping, then the emendation of '*mrw* to *mr* makes complete con-

("weep"), cf. N. LOHFINK, "Enthielten die im Alten Testament bezeugten Klageriten eine Phase des Schweigens?", *VT* 12 (1962) 275-277.

(7) For a similar thought cf. Ps 6,7; and for the opposite sentiment (rejoicing upon their beds), cf. Ps 149,5.

(8) A hapax in the Psalter, '*mr+blbb* occurs 11 times elsewhere; the equivalent '*mr+blb* is even more frequent, occurring 18 times. Synonymous *dbr+blb(b)* appears twice, '*mr+llbb* and '*mr+l lb* once each. For a list of the texts cf. C. A. and E. G. BRIGGS, *The Book of Psalms I* (Edinburgh 1906) 35.

(9) DAHOOD, *Psalms I*, 24, renders '*mrw blbbkm* as "examine your conscience" (lit. "look into your heart") on the basis of '*mr* — "see, look".

(10) Among those who accepted this emendation, originally proposed by Duhm, are GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen*, 17; H. SCHMIDT, *Die Psalmen* (HAT 15; Tübingen 1934) 8; C. WESTERMANN, *Ausgewählte Psalmen* (Göttingen 1984) 92.

(11) For other instances of *spd+mrr*, cf. Jer 6,26, Zech 12,10.

(12) For other instances of *bkh+mrr*, cf. 1 Sam 1,10, Isa 22,4, and Ruth 1,13-14.

textual sense: "bitterly . . . upon your beds weep!" Furthermore, the emendation requires only a common scribal error, a dittography of the final 'alep of the preceding word (i.e., 'alep is the final consonant of preceding *thl*' before the addition of *waw* as mater lectionis)⁽¹³⁾. And once *mr* was transformed by scribal error to 'mr, the juxtaposition of 'mr with *blbbkm* inevitably suggested the common idiom 'mr *blb(b)*, of which there are some 30 occurrences in the OT. Finally, when *thl*' was provided with final *waw* as a mater lectionis, so was 'mr, becoming 'mrw.

A question, however, remains; what is the meaning of *blbbkm*, once 'mrw is seen to be a textual error? The answer to this question has been provided by Terence Collins in his discussion of the physiology of tears in the OT⁽¹⁴⁾. In this important work the author examined a substantial number of OT passages (chiefly from Psalms and Lamentations) that deal with weeping, in order to understand what physiological occurrences were understood to take place in the process of weeping. He discovered from these texts that tears arise "from a breakdown of the firm substance of the heart which becomes weak and turns to water. The water then makes its way out through throat and eyes and appears as tears running down the face"⁽¹⁵⁾. On the connection between tears and bitterness, he goes on to suggest that the source of the bitter taste in the mouth, produced by weeping, is the heart, the source of bitterness as well as of tears⁽¹⁶⁾. Seen against this background, the meaning of *blbbkm* becomes clear: the preposition *b* has separative force, and *mr blbbkm* means "bitterly from your hearts."

Having brought together these several observations on *wdmw* and on 'mrw (<*mr) *blbbkm*, we can propose this translation for Ps 4,5:

Tremble, and do not sin;
weep bitterly from your hearts, upon your beds⁽¹⁷⁾.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, DC 20064

John S. KSELMANN

⁽¹³⁾ F. M. CROSS-D. N. FREEDMAN, *Early Hebrew Orthography* (New Haven, CT 1952) 56-57.

⁽¹⁴⁾ T. COLLINS, "The Physiology of Tears in the Old Testament", *CBQ* 33 (1971) 18-38; 185-197.

⁽¹⁵⁾ COLLINS, "Physiology", 31.

⁽¹⁶⁾ COLLINS, "Physiology", 36: "It is evident, then that part of the physiological process of weeping is the production of a bitter taste in the mouth. I would suggest that the source of the bitterness should be sought in the same place as the origin of tears, viz. in the disturbance in the intestines".

⁽¹⁷⁾ In the context of Psalm 4, "bitterness from your hearts" (v. 5) contrasts effectively with "joy in my heart" (v. 9: *šmhh blby*); and cf. Ps 149,5.

Psalm 122,3.4: A New Reading

Ps 122,3.4 offers several textual difficulties:

yrwšlm hbnwyh k'yr šhbrh lh yḥdw
ššm 'lw šbty m šbty yh
'dwt lyśr' l lhdwt lšm yhw h

The following reading is proposed for these problematic verses:

Jerusalem--(her) builder is Yah;
 indeed, a city which he chose for himself.
 To it the tribes go up,
 the tribes of Yah;
 For he made it a sworn obligation for Israel
 to praise Yahweh's name.

(her) builder is Yah:

The term *hbnwyh* is usually rendered "built/rebuilt⁽¹⁾". However, the significance of such a statement in this psalm is unclear⁽²⁾. Therefore, the reading *habbenuyāh-(yāh)*⁽³⁾ is proposed⁽⁴⁾. Yahweh as builder of Jerusalem is attested in Ps 147,2:

(¹) Some scholars date the psalm by means of this term (so C. KEET, *A Study of the Psalms of Ascents* [Greenwood, S. C. 1969]; M. BUTTENWIESER, *The Psalms Chronologically Treated with a New Translation* [Chicago 1938]; O. LORETZ, *Die Psalmen* [AOAT 207/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn]; et al.). Conversely, *BDB* (Oxford 1968) 124, does not list this verse under its entry for the nuance "rebuilt".

(²) The feminine passive participle is attested only here. Interestingly, the LXX divides this verse differently, reading *hōs pólis* with the preceding phrase (*Ierusalēm oikodouménē*) rather than with the following phrase (*hēs hē metochē autēs epì tò autō*). This division is followed by several modern commentators (e.g., Gunkel; Dahood) and certainly results in a more balanced line. (For a good discussion of the implications of the various divisions, see L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL and A. STRUS, "Salmo 122: Canto al nombre de Jerusalén", *Bib* 61 [1980] 241.) However, it is less than clear what significance one would attach to the statement: "Jerusalem, built as a city". J. DERENBOURG, "Zur Psalmenerklärung", *ZAW* 1 (1881) 333, considers *yrwšlm hbnwyh* to be in apposition to v.2b. Based upon his interpretation of Ps 122 as a pilgrimage song, he regards v.3 as a reference to the two cities the psalmist would see as he enters Jerusalem—the permanent city and the pilgrimagers' tent city.

(³) Lit.: "the one built by Yah".

(⁴) The definite article would then function as a relative, paralleling *š* in the second colon. Such a use of the definite article with a participle is attested in Phoenician: *'ztwd' hbrk b'l* (*KAI* 26.A1.1). Cf. also Jer 25,26 for the definite article attached to a bound form. This construction would also form a stylistic parallel with *šbty yh*.

bnh (act ptc⁽⁵⁾) *yrwšlm yhwh*
ndhy ysr'l ykns.

Throughout Ps 122 the psalmist emphasizes the importance of Jerusalem as the city of David and as the city of the temple. The significance of the temple for the monarchy is evidenced in 1 Chr 22,19:

l' nbnh byt lšm yhwh 'd hymym hhm.

which he chose for himself:

This colon is fraught with difficulties. The text is uncertain; the syntax is unclear. The Versions evidence the uncertainty of this colon:

11QPs^a: *šhbrh lw*⁽⁶⁾
 LXX: *hēs hē metochē autēs epī tò autō*⁽⁷⁾
 Syr: *dkryk lh šwr'*⁽⁸⁾

This colon has been interpreted generally in two ways. Those who follow the MT see here a reference to the manner in which the city is constructed. The city is closely compacted⁽⁹⁾. Those who follow the LXX see here a reference to the people within the city. They live in harmonious togetherness⁽¹⁰⁾. These interpretations have one major shortcoming—*hbr* nowhere else occurs with either *bnh* or *'yr*⁽¹¹⁾. Furthermore, the significance of the construction of Jerusalem is inconsequential in the remainder of the psalm. Because of this, the following emendation is proposed: *šebēḥārāh lō*⁽¹²⁾. This emendation has three supports in its favor. First, it is partially supported by 11QPs^a⁽¹³⁾. Second, the verb *bḥr* occurs frequently in discussions concerning

⁽⁵⁾ Similarly, in Ps 122,3a, one might suggest a reading *habbōnē yāh*.

⁽⁶⁾ 11QPs^a reads *lw* in reference to Jerusalem elsewhere in Pss 4,4; 125,2.

⁽⁷⁾ Lit.: "whose participation is together". Codex Alexandrinus reads: *hoi métochoi* ("participants"). Possibly the LXX read *šeḥebrā* for MT *šēhubbērā*.

⁽⁸⁾ Lit.: "which is encircled (by) a wall".

⁽⁹⁾ So H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalmen* (BKAT 15/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1961); M. DAHOOD, *Psalms 101–150* (AB; New York 1970); et. al. Other scholars emphasize the correctness of this position by citing the Syr. (so BUTTENWIESER, *Psalms*; C. BRIGGS, *The Psalms* [ICC; New York 1908]; E. BEAUCAMP, *Le Psautier* [SB; Paris 1979]). KEET, *Psalms of Ascents*, retains the reference to the city, but emends the text. He reads *šēhorbā*: "which was ruined". The significance is that Jerusalem, formerly devastated, has now been rebuilt.

⁽¹⁰⁾ So H. GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen* (Göttingen 1968); S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalmenstudien* II (Kristiania 1922) 142; A. WEISER, *The Psalms* (OTL; Philadelphia 1962).

⁽¹¹⁾ This criticism cannot be said of the emendation by KEET, *Psalms of Ascents*, who supplies evidence.

⁽¹²⁾ Alternatively, one might vocalize: *šebēḥurāh lō yaḥdō*. This vocalization would nicely parallel the vocalization of *hbnwyh* suggested above. However, given the tendency within the *šyry-hm'lw* to use grammatical variation for stylistic effect, the above reading is proposed (for a fuller discussion of stylistic features in the *šyry-hm'lw*, see my unpublished dissertation: "The *Šyry-Hm'lw* (Psalms 120–134): A Philological and Stylistic Analysis", The Johns Hopkins University, 1982).

⁽¹³⁾ 11QPs^a omits *yḥdw*; it also reads *lw* (however; see n. 6 above).

King David⁽¹⁴⁾, Jerusalem⁽¹⁵⁾, and Zion⁽¹⁶⁾. Jerusalem is the city where Yahweh chose to put his name:

1 Kgs 11,36: *byrwšlm h'yr 'šr bhrty ly lšwm šmy šm*

1 Kgs 14,21: *byrwšlm h'yr 'šr bhr yhw h lšwm 't šmw šm mkl šbty yšr'l...*

Finally, this concept fits well within the context of the psalm. The psalmist exults in Jerusalem, the center of the Davidic kingdom and the location of Yahweh's temple. The psalm is replete with archaic notions harking back to the glorious days of the Davidic monarchy, when Yahweh's beneficent protection of Jerusalem was self-evident. The psalmist extols Jerusalem as Yahweh's special city, which he himself selected and chose. This reconstructed text finds its most striking parallel in Ps 78,68.69:

wybhr 't šbt yhw dh 't hr šywn 'šr 'hb

wybn kmw rym mqdšw k'rš ysdh l'wlm⁽¹⁷⁾.

Several of the passages cited in support of this reconstruction contain terms which occur in the following verses of Ps 122.

to it:

11QPs^a reads *šmh* for MT *ššm* (cf. Syr. *ltnn*). However, the MT is preferred for two reasons: 1) the relative *š* occurs frequently in the *šyry-hm'lw*t; 2) the reading *šmh* is more likely due to the influence of v.5⁽¹⁸⁾.

tribes of Yah:

This expression occurs nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible⁽¹⁹⁾. J. Kugel emends this line to read: *šbty h'dwt lyšr'l* ("the tribes of Israel's assemblies")⁽²⁰⁾. His emendation results in an odd sounding expression.

⁽¹⁴⁾ 1 Sam 10,24; 2 Sam 6,21; 1 Kgs 8,16; cf. Deut 17,15.

⁽¹⁵⁾ 2 Chr 6,6 (with *šem*); Isa 14,1; Zech 1,17; 2,16; 3,2.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Note especially Ps 132,12d-13:

yšbw lks' lk
ky bhr yhw h bgywn
'wh lmwšb lw.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Recently it has been argued that Ps 78 is a poem originating in the early monarchical period (see A. F. CAMPBELL, "Ps 78: A Contribution to the Theology of Tenth Century Israel", *CBQ* 41 [1979] 51-79).

⁽¹⁸⁾ Paronomasia is evident throughout the psalm (note especially vv.6.7). Significantly, ALONSO SCHÖKEL and STRUS, "Salmo 122", consider paronomasia in Ps 122 a "poetic generator". For them, the examples of paronomasia occur in groups of three in the psalm, and have not only an articulatory effect but also a compositional function. The threesome herein featured would be:

š-
š-šm
-šm (šmh?).

⁽¹⁹⁾ The expression *šbty yšr'l* is common in the Deuteronomic history and in Chronicles.

⁽²⁰⁾ *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History* (New Haven 1981) 66-67. He considers the *yod* of *yh* dittography, and the *he* becomes a definite article. For him, this syntactical arrangement (construct chain with genitive *lamedh*) parallels the following line (*lbyt dwyd*).

he made it a sworn obligation for Israel:

11QPs^a reads 'dt for MT 'dwt⁽²¹⁾. The term 'dwt is regularly used by the Priestly writer to designate a pact or covenant (often the Decalogue)⁽²²⁾. It is a term with early covenantal overtones⁽²³⁾. A parallel nuance of 'dwt is found in the following passages:

Ps 78,5: *wqym 'dwt by'qb wtwrh śm byśr'l*

Ps 81,6: 'dwt byhwsp śmw bś'tw 'l 'rś mśrym⁽²⁴⁾.

This emendation is prompted by two factors: 1) the collocation of *śym* and 'dwt in Ps 81,6; 2) the irregularity of vv.4.5. The lines are quite uneven. The phrase 'dwt *lyśr'l* has no obvious connection with what precedes or follows as it now stands. Thus, one can insert *ky śmh* from v.5 (lost through haplography)⁽²⁵⁾ before 'dwt and repoint it *kī śāmōh*⁽²⁶⁾.

Although certainty in such difficult passages is impossible, the above emendations are offered as plausible readings which provide meaning within the larger context of Ps 122.

Institute for Christian Studies
1909 University Ave.
Austin, TX 78705
U.S.A.

Rick R. MARRS

⁽²¹⁾ So also Symmachus, who reads *ekklēsia*. 11QPs^a also omits the *lamedh* as a vocative, an interpretation which is unnecessary (see P. MILLER, JR., "Vocative Lamed in the Psalter: A Reconsideration", *UF* 11 [1979] 634).

⁽²²⁾ P uses 'dwt where other writers use *bryt* (e.g., 'rwn 'dwt; *lwhwt h'dwt*; cf. Exod 25,16 with Gen 9,12; 17,2).

⁽²³⁾ The term 'dy' is the regular term for covenant/treaty in the Sefire inscriptions.

⁽²⁴⁾ In Ps 78,5, 'dwt is the object of *qwm* (which often occurs with *bryt*). In Ps 81,6, it occurs with *śym*. The verbal *śym* + 'dwt also occurs in the Sefire treaty: "And this is the treaty ('dy') of the gods which the gods established (*śmw*)". These references provide the basis for the above emendation.

⁽²⁵⁾ Certainly haplography would not be unexpected within such repetitive lines. In v. 5a the *ky śmh* should be retained, even though numerous commentators consider the line overloaded and suggest various emendations (see e.g., GUNKEL, *Die Psalmen*; BRIGGS, *Psalms*; LORETZ, *Die Psalmen*; MOWINCKEL, *Psalmenstudien* II, 5, 191; *Real and Apparent Tricola in Hebrew Psalm Poetry* [Oslo 1957] 75). Not only is it important stylistically (see above, n. 18), but a *ky* clause regularly follows *ydh* in the Psalter, introducing the reason for praise (see further, G. MAYER, "yādāh", *TDOT* V, 433-434).

⁽²⁶⁾ I am indebted to Prof. Delbert Hillers of The Johns Hopkins University for this improved reading and argumentation. This conjecture is not without its difficulties. The form *śāmōh* is quite in accord with orthography elsewhere in the *śyry-hm'lw*. However, this exact syntactical arrangement is to my knowledge unparalleled. The use of the infinitive construct as an object (here in apposition) is well attested (see GKC § 114m), as are examples of a double object (see C. BROCKELMANN, *Hebräische Syntax* [Neukirchen 1956] § 94b-d; for objects in apposition, see GKC § 131m). Nevertheless, the above proposal has clear thematic parallels in the Psalter (see 7,18; 54,8; 96,12; [with the infinitive *lhdwt*] 119,62; 142,8; 106,47). The closest grammatical parallel may be Ps 105,21:

*śmw 'dwn lbytw wml bkl qnyw
l'sr śryw bnpśw wzqnyw yḥkm.*

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Moshe GARSIEL, *The First Book of Samuel. A Literary Study of Comparative Structures, Analogies and Parallels*. 169 p. Ramat-Gan 1985. Revivim Publishing House.

Un courant récent de l'exégèse, principalement chez les Juifs et dans le monde anglo-saxon, lit la Bible comme œuvre littéraire. C'est dans cette ligne que se situe l'étude de M. Garsiel, traduction anglaise d'un ouvrage paru en 1983 en hébreu. La perspective est décidément synchronique, car, selon l'auteur, seule une telle perspective permet d'envisager 1 S pour ce qu'il est: l'œuvre d'un véritable auteur qui, certes, travaillait avec un matériau préexistant, mais qui a su reprendre celui-ci dans une composition artistique originale et bien unifiée (11-16). C'est ce dernier point que Garsiel entend illustrer à partir de l'analyse des éléments qui, en 1 S, se prêtent à une comparaison, en négligeant volontairement les doublets, mais en examinant systématiquement analogies et parallèles. Après avoir décrit les éléments susceptibles de faire l'objet de comparaisons, il énumère les techniques auxquelles l'auteur recourt pour établir ces comparaisons: contiguïté, références explicites et liens implicites, narratifs et linguistiques (16-27). Avec un tel outil, il est à même de repérer les similitudes et les contrastes qui permettent de mieux comprendre les personnages du récit et le message du texte. On découvre ainsi les personnages de Samuel (ch. 1) et de Saül (ch. 3-5), ainsi que les traits majeurs de l'opposition entre judicature et royauté (ch. 2). Au fil des pages, Garsiel accumule ainsi les «structures comparatives» à l'intérieur de 1 S, avec l'intention de montrer qu'elles résultent d'une volonté littéraire unique, celle de l'auteur. Et là où une comparaison avec un passage d'un autre livre biblique est possible, il parle de dépendance: le plus souvent, celle-ci a été voulue pour l'effet de sens qu'elle ménage (30).

L'intérêt de cet ouvrage réside principalement dans la formalisation et l'analyse systématique des comparaisons et des analogies de 1 S. Mais il y a des faiblesses. Ainsi, la thèse qui est en arrière-fond et que j'ai mentionnée à la fin du résumé. Parler d'auteur ou de dépendance littéraire revient à formuler une affirmation non seulement littéraire, mais aussi historique. Or Garsiel esquivé les questions historiques et les laisse le plus souvent dans le flou. Un exemple. Le parallèle entre 1 S 7,3-4, Jos 24,14-24 et Jg 10,6-10 n'est pas retenu parce que ces deux derniers textes sont deutéronomiques et postérieurs à l'œuvre de l'auteur de 1 S. Il ne peut donc s'agir d'un emprunt délibéré (55-56). Mais plus loin, 1 S 10,17-19 est rapproché sans problème de Jg 6,8-10 — attribué d'habitude à Dtr —, et là, on parle de ressemblance non acci-

dentelle (79-80). Avant de parler de dépendance, il faudrait déterminer la chronologie des rédactions et traditions. Et, à supposer que ceci soit fait, une grande prudence resterait de mise pour parler d'emprunts conscients guidés par un projet délibéré de l'auteur. Une base analytique strictement littéraire s'avère trop étroite pour fonder à elle seule une hypothèse concernant l'auteur.

Les analyses littéraires de Garsiel foisonnent d'intuitions suggestives et pertinentes. Sans conteste, il parvient à montrer que l'étude des structures comparatives est indispensable pour une juste compréhension du récit et de ses éléments constitutifs — événements, personnages, institutions, etc. Malheureusement, il se borne trop souvent à établir les comparaisons sans s'interroger sur leur nature exacte (points de contacts et différences) ou sur leurs effets littéraires et narratifs. Ainsi, p.ex., après avoir montré combien le portrait du jeune Saül est ambigu (c. 9-11), les nombreux éléments sympathiques étant entachés d'ombres inquiétantes, il ne tire qu'une conclusion générale sur la royauté, pierre d'achoppement qui fait chuter les meilleurs (76-84). Parfois, il se contente d'une rapide mention là où une analyse plus fouillée se serait avérée intéressante, comme p.ex. la comparaison entre 1 S 11 et Jg 19-20 (83-84). Il arrive aussi à Garsiel de manquer de nuance dans l'interprétation de certains indices littéraires, comme lorsqu'il affirme qu'à partir de 13,8-14, l'auteur devient entièrement critique vis-à-vis de Saül (84-85). Si la plupart des parallèles relevés par Garsiel jettent une lumière neuve sur les textes, certaines comparaisons sont peu convaincantes: celle qu'il établit entre David et Joseph (120-121) est trop générique et n'a aucune base verbale explicite. Enfin, on pourrait ajouter d'autres parallèles à ceux que mentionne Garsiel. Il aurait pu comparer, p.ex., les récits de condamnation de Saül et de David (1 S 15 et 2 S 12) puisque la faute de l'un et de l'autre consiste à avoir épargné du petit et du gros bétail (au propre en 1 S 15,15, et au figuré en 2 S 12,4a) et ainsi fait le mal en n'écoutant pas Yahvé (1 S 15,19,23, et 2 S 12,13).

L'édition, par ailleurs soignée, pourrait être améliorée. Il serait utile de vérifier, pour les citations mises en parallèle, les caractères gras (hébreu) et les italiques (anglais) qui soulignent les mots identiques, car les erreurs y sont source de confusion: voir p. 42 (1 S 4,6), p. 46 (Ex 2,11), p. 78 (Ex 3,7,10), p. 79 (1 S 10, 17), p. 80 (1 S 11,6) en hébreu; et p. 46 (1 S 3,19), p. 47 (Ex 3,9), p. 48 (Nb 16,15 et 1 S 12,3), p. 50 (les deux citations), p. 79 (Jg 6,6) et p. 90 (Jg 8,27) en traduction. Quelques fautes se sont glissées çà et là: p. 33, 1.7, lire *ša'al*; p. 66, 1.9, lire *chapters* (cf. note 26); p. 73, 1.11, lire *Šmw'l* (ou *Šemu'el*); p. 74, 1.8, lire *šm'*; p. 84, 1.9, lire *inhabitants*; p. 98, 1.32, lire *David*; p. 114, 1.6, lire *appearance*; p. 162, 1.2, lire *Richter*; p. 165, corriger la référence de *I. Hylander* (majuscules); p. 166, lire *McCarthy*; p. 162-166 (passim), lire *CBQ* et non *CBO*. On cherche en vain l'appel de la note 48 du ch. 2 (p. 73). Un index des citations bibliques n'aurait certainement pas été superflu et aurait facilité la consultation de cet ouvrage utile et plein d'intérêt malgré ses lacunes.

Simon J. DeVRIES, *1 Kings* (Word Biblical Commentary 12). LXIV — 286 p. Waco, Texas, 1985. Word Books, Publisher.

In this book, DeVries brings together modern critical scholarship and evangelical Christian homiletics in a form that will be useful to students, ministers, scholars and teachers. A substantial introduction treats the historical and cultural world of 1 Kings, scriptural history as theological testimony, 1 Kings as literary composition, and various text critical problems. For his detailed commentary, De Vries divides the biblical book into units defined by considering form, content, and history of redaction. For each section he provides (1) a translation, with copious notes; (2) an outline of literary structure with discussion of form, genre, setting, and redaction; (3) an exposition of the sense of the text with attention to various redactional layers and historical issues; (4) a theological "explanation", intended to serve Christian readers who are "striving to learn from Scripture itself how better to interpret it, and accordingly how better to subject themselves to it" (p. ix). DeVries includes extensive bibliographies which are representative of a broad range of scholarship.

This is a thorough, though conventionally conceived, work. DeVries compresses an enormous amount of research into brief space. In the attempt to touch most of the main critical issues, the authour is unrivaled among recent commentators, who consider many of the same problems, but emphasize one or two in the resulting discussion. For example, T. Hobbs contributes to this same Word Commentary series (*2 Kings* [Waco, Texas 1985]), but focuses comment and analysis on the composite form of the canonical text. Similarly, B. Long, *1 Kings with an Introduction to Historical Literature* (Grand Rapids 1984), blends form critical analyses of the canonical text with a style of close reading associated with secular literary studies. On the other hand, E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige* (Göttingen 1977-84), and G. Hentschel, *1 Könige; 2 Könige* (Würzburg 1984-85), allow high visibility to a theory of redactional history and the theological nuances of various editors.

Writing from within the evangelical Christian tradition, DeVries primarily addresses those who, according to the series editors, presumably share with him a "commitment to scripture as divine revelation, and to the power of the Christian gospel" (p. x). In defense of the validity of criticism for theological understanding, the author argues in many different ways that historical researches enable one to confront the originary moment of revelation, the first word, and God's normative address to a modern Christian reader.

First, DeVries seeks the original witness to that revelation in a Hebrew text reconstructed after exhaustive evaluation of textual variants. In such cases, he casts aside dogmatic preference for one or another version — including the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts — and considers each variant anew with an eye to its possibly representing the oldest reading. This is a typical operation for the Biblical scholar who privileges the original writer in the search for authoritative religious truth. Confident judgements are offered the non-specialist reader and justified in copious notes appended to the translation. DeVries appears untroubled by the appearance, or perhaps the real-

ity, of arbitrariness that is inevitably involved in such quest (see E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* [Jerusalem 1981]; *idem*. "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitations of Textual Rules" *HTR* 75 [1982] 429-448). He certainly does not question the surety to be gained from historically oriented criticism.

One sees a second version of the quest for originary word in DeVries' preference for reconstructed original traditions over any later editings, or for that matter, over the composite canonical text. He depicts the form and structure of each passage with an outline that visually demotes secondary material; it is contained within brackets, identified as expansion or gloss, and allowed far less detail and space. Subsequent discussion tends to treat such secondariness as intrusive in an otherwise sensible union of form and content. Similarly, while discussing the history of redaction, DeVries concentrates on the earliest layer he can identify. Thus the author swims against a tide of fashion. He does not follow the way of canonical critics, and he especially dislikes those redaction critics, who, having "gone too far, . . . transfer more and more material from the realm of early tribal tradition into that of the sheer literary activity associated with court and temple". DeVries asserts the theological necessity of reaching back to the Bible's "elemental oral and written units . . . [where one has the] . . . real possibility of perceiving — and receiving — an authentic word of God within the words of man" (p. xli). Here one will discover the normative message of Scripture unburdened with secondary accretions (see pp. xlix-lII and 266). The irony of turning away from hypothetical editors in favor of hypothetical "authors" escapes DeVries entirely. And in opposing "sheer literary activity" to, presumably, historical verisimilitude captured in those "elemental" traditions, DeVries appears unmoved by discussions about historiography which deny such clear distinctions between factuality and its literary rendering.

A third quest for the originary: DeVries vests the (original) Book of Kings with reliability at its inception. The work has a "directly factual basis" (p. xlix), and through factuality, of course, one meets authentic revelation. The definitive edition was produced in the late 7th century B.C. and revised in the early 6th century by a "school" of writers and editors who shared the ideals enshrined in the Book of Deuteronomy, and who drew upon various sources to write a "Deuteronomistic" (Dtr) history. As key sources, DeVries cites — and incidentally reveals his scale of values — "literal reports", (e.g., the account of how Solomon came to succeed David, the narrative of Rehoboam's rejection and various temple archives), and "imaginative interpretations", (e.g., the stories about the Queen of Sheba and various prophets). There are also post-Dtr expansions of First Kings, which DeVries mentions "not so much because of any intrinsic value . . . but to be reminded that the Scriptures retained the force of dynamic growth . . . after the definitive work had been completed" (p. lII). Clearly DeVries prefers "literal reports" for theological (historical) reasons, and out of the same matrix, believes 1 Kings to rest on a factual base. It may, or probably, does. But all one actually possesses is a version of history which claims to be bound by the facts. Even in those "elemental units" it is doubtful that one has hold of "history". (DeVries may in fact conceptualize matters inconsis-

tently, because elsewhere he seems to applaud the “historicality” of the Bible, that is, its self-awareness of transcendent perspective—or, it seems, factuality interpreted.) In any case, human language seems unable to yield pictures of reality direct enough to satisfy DeVries’ desire to embed theological truth in historical verisimilitude.

A fourth quest for the originary appears in DeVries’ claim that the original 1 Kings is itself original. DeVries asserts that the Books of Kings were part of ancient Israel’s unique historiographic testimony to God’s transcendental purposes. “... the Hebrews were the first to come up with genuine historiography... (because) they alone defined themselves in historical rather than mythological language... (that is) concerned with real historical event, interpreted from a transcendental perspective” (pp. xxxii and xxxvi). DeVries may wish to rehabilitate that slightly older formula of Israel’s religious singularity, “God acts in history”, which has of late been widely questioned and abandoned (see B. Albrektson, *History and the Gods: An Essay on the Idea of Historical Events as Divine Manifestations in the Ancient Near East and in Israel* [Lund 1967]). The claim amounts to special pleading in the interest of theology: Israel’s testimony to the ways of God makes for the genuine article (against Herodotus, who is [wrongly] criticized for lacking teleology [p. xxx], and secular historians, who similarly disregard God [p. xxxi]). And if the Bible offers unique “historiography”, then confronting God’s word is at least possible, uniquely.

For its intended purposes and audience, the commentary may convincingly support evangelical application with scholarly foundations — but only if one grants the assumptions and parochialism that mortise and tenon the structure, and if one accepts special pleading as argument. Nevertheless, DeVries impressively sifts massive researches and often walks independently of scholarly consensus. He communicates deftly with scholars and laypeople, and steadily aims at Christological allusion.

Yet the author sometimes sounds a tone of strident moralism, as though the Christian faith aided by historically oriented critical method somehow justify the victorious. On source and redaction criticism: “... a variant story [narrative B]... was written down, and then edited to be incorporated into Narrative A. It now looked as if the two were really one — and so it has seemed to every generation but our own” (p. 271). On Israel’s “radically new” (and superior) faith: “[Solomon’s] temple stood in the large open space... not in the midst of the city, like most heathen temples of the time... The fact that this was no rededicated temple, taken over from the dispossessed deity of some captive people, emphasizes that the religion devoted to him [Yahweh] was radically new” (p. 97). On the true evangelical spirit: “Using God comes naturally to the devotees of shrine religion” (p. 54). On the triumph of higher (Christian?) religion: “There is also a sub-biblical element of superstition in the Bethel prophet’s motive for burying the man of God in his own grave” (p. 172); “That it [the story of Solomon’s accession] does not present what we would call a flattering picture... is more than anything else an indictment of the low spiritual ideals of the time in which he lived” (p. 43).

Whether the attitudes implied by such statements are commensurate with

those held by members of the author's intended audience, I cannot say. However, the sentiments seem more sectarian than scholarly, and undermine the claims to historical rigor so evident throughout the commentary. Beyond this, such attitudes inevitably point to ethical problems which have always been endemic to Christian conviction and mission: what face will Christians and their books turn to those who believe, just as fervently, in some other religious fulfillment?

Department of Religion
Bowdoin College
Brunswick, ME 04011
U.S.A.

Burke O. LONG

Michael V. Fox, *The Song of Songs and the Ancient Egyptian Love Songs*. xxvii-454 p. Madison 1985. The University of Wisconsin Press.

As the title itself suggests, this book is a study in comparative literature. In this case it is a courageous undertaking which only someone who is both an accomplished Egyptologist and Biblical scholar would dare. Fox defines his goal as twofold—richer interpretation of both the Egyptian love songs and the Song of Songs. He places his emphasis upon the latter, “partly because earlier works usually illuminate later ones than the other way around, and partly because of a critical judgment that in artistry and insight the Song is a more significant object for interpretation” (xxvi).

In his introductory remarks the author states that in his opinion the similarities justify a hypothesis of probable genetic linkage. Acknowledging that a literary dependence cannot be proved without evidence of the author's acquaintance with the earlier works or other works that were themselves shaped under their influence, and admitting that such evidence is lacking, Fox proceeds by pointing out possible channels of transmission and making comparisons throughout the book. In the end he leaves the decision for or against his hypothesis up to the reader.

The organization of the book is excellent, and one of its notable strengths. It is divided into two parts of quasi-equal length. Part One deals with the texts themselves and Part Two (divided into six chapters) deals with the broader literary discussions which grow out of the exegesis of the poems, and which are often dependent upon the author's arguments in Part One. At the end of the volume there are three appendices containing some related Egyptian texts, a concordance of Egyptian words and the Hieroglyphic transcription of the Egyptian love songs. These appendices, along with five indices and a generous, up-to-date bibliography encourage the reader to pur-

sue personal points of interest with ease, and to make further use of the material.

Part One offers a fresh translation and commentary of the texts. Having defined his audience as belonging to two groups, readers who know Egyptian and have a background in Egyptology, and readers (in particular Bible scholars) who do not, Fox deals first (Chapter 1) with the Egyptian love poems. As one who does not have a background in Egyptian, this reviewer found the concise notes and commentary following each poem helpful and enlightening. The principal contribution here is Fox's argument that what are commonly regarded as collections of songs among the Egyptian texts are really unities, single songs composed of several stanzas, and that appreciation of these ancient songs has been hampered by an atomistic approach that fails to relate the parts of the poems to one another, thus missing the shape and the sense of the whole. This argument is continued in greater detail in Chapter 4. For the major songs (those composed of several stanzas) he provides his own titles which are more suggestive of their content.

In his commentary on the Song of Songs, Fox rejects the idea that it is a loose collection or anthology of short songs and favors the approach of an artistic unity. Thus, Chapter 2 opens with a complete, unbroken translation of the Song. The translation, for the most part faithful to the MT, is quite readable and accurately reflects the characteristic structures of Hebrew poetry. I found his version questionable in three cases: 1) In 1,4b, contrary to the accents, Fox divides the verse after *dōdēkā* and reprints *miyyayin* as *miyyeyn*: "We will be glad and rejoice in you; we will praise your caresses. More than smooth (wine) do they love you" (99-100). The emendation is consistent with his reading of *mēšārīm* in 7,10a: "and your palate like the best wine—flowing smoothly to my beloved" (163). 2) "Put me to bed among fruit clusters, spread me my bed among apricots, for I am sick with love", (2,5) rests upon his interpretation of the verb *smk* (piel). On the basis of Ps 3,6 Fox ascribes the sense of "putting to bed" or "preparing a bed". *rpd* has a similar meaning in Job 17,13, thus, he perceives the two verbs to be parallel in Cant 2,5. 3) The rhetorical question *mī zō't* (3,6; 6,10; 8,5a) is translated, "Look who's coming up from the wilderness" or "Look who's gazing down like the morning star". Fox's position is that 3,6 and 8,5a are a response of surprise and admiration by the Daughters of Jerusalem to the adjuration refrain (3,5; 8,4). It is more difficult to accept that 3,6 is a conclusion to 3,5 (and 8,5a a conclusion to 8,4) as he suggests, than the more usual interpretation that 3,6 is related to 3,7 as question and answer, and that both 3,6 and 8,5a begin a new unit rather than conclude one.

After translating and presenting the Song of Songs in its entirety, Fox subdivides it into nineteen units, and these units into sections, for the convenience of exegesis. He does not recognize the existence of any comprehensive scheme that would determine the division of the Song, but bases his segmentation upon "natural continuities of dialogue and events" (94). A discussion of the unity and structure of the Song follows in Chapter 4.

As the author takes up each segment in turn, he begins his exegesis with a general commentary on the meaning of the unit as a whole, then follows it with a verse by verse treatment of words and phrases requiring particular

comment. His sensitivity to the literary artistry of the text is continuously evident in the commentary. Parallel passages or constructions in the Egyptian songs are noted whenever possible. At times Fox's interpretation of a segment appears exaggerated by a desire to see a relatedness to the Egyptian songs. One example will have to suffice. Since a bower or booth in a garden or open field is a frequent setting for lovers' trysts in the Egyptian songs, he tends to find them everywhere in the Song of Songs: the chamber (*heder*) of the king (1,4b), his couch (1,12) and the house of wine (2,4) are all identified with the admittedly more credible bower of 1,16-17. In 3,7-11, the description of Solomon's litter and wedding day, he sees a song in which the "youth is praised indirectly through an enthusiastic and extravagant description of his leafy bed in a garden booth" (123). The young lovers are "fantasizing that their garden bower is their marriage bed" (314).

Part Two is written in such a way that one can select the chapters that are of primary interest and read them in the order of choice. They are not dependent upon one another for sense. It is advisable, however, to read Chapter 3 first. In it Fox discusses the dating of the poems and some "possible" channels of literary transmission from Egypt. He concludes that there is a gap of perhaps a thousand years between the Egyptian love songs (composed slightly earlier than the Ramesside period) and the Song of Songs (post-exilic and probably Hellenistic). He suggests that the most opportune time for the importation of the Egyptian Songs was during the period of Egyptian imperial rule in Palestine, the early 15th century through the late 12th century B.C. This time gap, the tentative nature of his discussion regarding literary transmission, and above all, the unwieldiness of comparing a great number of Egyptian love poems with a single example of Israelite love poetry, should be kept in mind when reading the succeeding chapters.

Chapter 4 addresses the question of literary composition. Fox challenges Herrmann's influential study *Altägyptische Liebesdichtung* (1959) which defined the length of the Egyptian songs by the pause marks in the texts. Herrmann considered the brief units of texts between the pause marks as independent songs, some of which were assembled in loose collections, others in cycles. Fox argues that some of these short units form parts (stanzas) of longer more complex poems and he distinguishes five criteria for his organization (201).

The chapter is a valuable contribution to the debate about the unity (or disunity) of the Song of Songs. Fox points out that the usual argument made for disunity comes from those who do not recognize a comprehensive structure in the Song. In Fox's judgment no such design has been demonstrated as yet, but he does not reject its unity for this reason. On the contrary, he finds several other unifying factors; 1) a network of "repetends" (usually called refrains); 2) associative sequences; 3) consistency of character portrayal; and 4) a (loose) narrative framework (209-218), which lead him to argue in favor of a poetic unity and a single author (218-226).

In Chapter 5 Fox questions the function of the love song genre as a whole in Egypt and Israel, considering which of the settings available in these cultures is the context most suitable for the creation of such songs. He firmly rejects the idea that either the Egyptian songs or the Song of Songs were

courting songs, wedding songs, love magic, mortuary songs or religious poetry. His conclusion is that their sole purpose was entertainment. The argumentation is this chapter is faulty and prejudiced by Fox's presupposition that Egyptian love poetry and the Song can be reduced to a common denominator in order to make comparisons. (What is not true of the Egyptian songs cannot be true of the Canticle; what is true of the Egyptian songs must likewise be true of the Canticle.) The common denominator is an understanding of human love fixed at an adolescent stage, and an absolute secularity. Not only are the songs not about gods or representatives of the gods, nor Sacred Marriage Songs: the only connection they had with religion was that the banquets at which they were sung were commonly held during the leisure time afforded by religious holidays.

In an excursus at the end of Chapter 5 (250-252) Fox suggests how the Song of Songs (which he considers totally inappropriate as an analogy for the bond between God and Israel) may have been incorporated into Sacred Scripture. It came about he says as a result of the religious leadership legitimizing a song which had already been associated with the people's religious life, because of its use at times of feasting, by means of an allegorical interpretation.

Chapter 6 analyzes and compares the formal features of character presentation; the overall dramatic character of the poems; the forms of discourse, and the special uses of grammatical person when the lovers speak of or to themselves, of or to one another. Chapter 7 highlights ten identifiable themes present in the love songs and compares their use in the Egyptian and Israelite contexts. These two chapters are especially well done and certainly lead to a richer appreciation of similarities, differences, and areas of uniqueness.

In the final chapter the author endeavors to draw together some general ideas on the subject of love and sexuality gleaned from his comparisons. It is at one and the same time full of insight and flawed by a private polemic. On the one hand he points out with moving clarity how mature and advanced the vision of love expressed in the Song of Songs is in contrast with the Egyptian love poems. Where the earlier songs are far more introspective, using internal monologues to explore the feelings and emotions of love, the Song is predominantly outward looking, centered upon the loved one, oriented to praise and engaged in dialogue. "The Song, in its perception of love as communion and as a way of seeing the world, goes beyond the Egyptian vision of love".

On the other hand, Fox insists on the "secularity" shared by both elements in his comparison. The discussion in Chapter 5 makes it clear that this sense of secularity means that the literal sense of the Song of Songs has no religious meaning whatsoever (nor does it open to the transcendent), that the vision of love and sexuality portrayed in it could not enter "sacred Scripture" without the imposition of an allegorical interpretation that would conceal the literal one. It is unclear why he so categorically rejects the idea that the setting of the Song was marriage and why he denies that the subject of marriage even exists in it (against the textual evidence) except that the topic does not enter the Egyptian songs. In Chapter 8 he repeats the emphasis on

secularity and the unmarried state of the lovers. He would have us believe that in Canticles as well as in the Egyptian songs, "sexual intercourse does not consummate marriage. Rather marriage will consummate sex..."

On the basis of the evidence provided by this book, especially in Part Two, there are many who will reject both this insistence on the "secularity" of the poem in the sense that Fox uses it and the fixation on the adolescent range of meaning. It goes beyond both. One is prompted to ask the further question of whether the differences between the Egyptian songs and the Song of Songs are due only to time and culture gaps, or if the Song has not a basically different starting point. The author appears to have made his "hypothesis" of literary dependence a principle of interpretation and limited a fuller appreciation of the Song of Songs by doing so.

1417 Michigan Avenue
Alma, Michigan 48801
USA

M. T. ELLIOTT

Samuel TERRIEN, *Till the Heart Sings: Biblical Theology of Manhood and Womanhood*. x-260 p. 23,5x15,5. Philadelphia 1985. Fortress Press.

The broad contours of this study are interesting and engaging. Terrien holds that a *biblical* theology of manhood and womanhood is necessary because the Holy Scripture is the common ground and point of reference for the universal church in all generations. The biblical theologian is given the task of retracing the events, situations, and themes "that have molded the Hebraic, Jewish, and Christian anthropologies of the sexes" (5). Although he does not discuss "a God-centered humanism" until the last chapter, it is apparent that this is his theological perspective in the entire work. It is a humanism that is biblically oriented, monotheistic, and affirmative of the divinely given potential of all human beings whatever their race or sex.

This book, like all the *œuvre* Terrien, treats the reader to the rich resources of Terrien's learning and insight. He covers broad vistas in history, comparative religion, and literary analysis. There are very few exegetes who have attained his mastery in Hebrew Bible and can also move so easily in intertestamental literature and the New Testament. This work could be employed as an introduction to biblical theology that is much less academic and technical than his *The Elusive Presence* (New York 1978).

However, the specific intention of the book is to show how the Old and New Testaments reveal a theology of manhood and womanhood that was unique in antiquity and that poses a challenge to modern theology. For me the book is a disappointment with respect to this specific intention and the argument that carries it.

The book's chapters could each almost be separate essays in their own

right. There is a certain structural coherence about the whole, but it expresses itself more as a configuration of facets offering openings to the same central subject than as a strictly logical diachronic argument. I have no problem with that, but the question is, which facets to select for critical discussion?

T.'s understanding of God as "Father" is, to my mind, the chief facet of the book, the one that offers the greatest critical insight while being simultaneously the most problematic. His treatment of the Israelite metaphor of God as father in the context of ancient Near Eastern religion and culture is a good survey. He argues forcefully that "the metaphor of divine fatherhood" as "an expression of moralistic or ritualistic tyranny... was current only among the Jerusalem priests who founded Judaism" [the post-exilic Jewish cult in Jerusalem] (69). "The prophets promoted equality between men and women". It was the postexilic priestly theocracy "that debased the religious status of womanhood with its legal strictures on sexual purity and the new meaning it conferred upon the rite of circumcision" (70).

T.'s conclusions concerning priesthood and prophecy may be too sweeping, particularly with regard to the claim for prophecy. The real problem comes in his examination of New Testament writings. The heart of what he wants to say about divine fatherhood is found in the chapter on Jesus, women, and the fatherhood of God. At the beginning of the chapter he poses a rhetorical question which contains his thesis: Might it be that the meaning Jesus conferred on divine fatherhood was directly responsible for his unprecedented revolt against the patriarchal mores of his environment? (121). He then mounts a case that is based primarily on Jesus' relationship with various women according to the Gospel of Luke. He concludes, "The name father, which he favored as a designation of God, paradoxically reflected his radical overthrow of patriarchy" (138). He goes on to a brief discussion of the epithet *abba*, describing it as an "Aramaic term of endearment" (139).

This chapter (ch. 8) is a methodological morass. The most serious flaw is T.'s failure to consider critical literary and redactional issues in making such extensive use of Luke. This failure also vitiates the subsequent chapter on men and women in the infant church, which draws heavily upon Acts as well as Luke. Luke-Acts *may* reflect an admirable participation of women in some church circles of the 1st century A.D. We certainly see there the evangelist's concern with women in the church, but the point is that the evangelist's theological agenda and literary creativity should be taken into account. To what extent is the picture of women in Luke-Acts a "fiction" that serves the writer's *Tendenz*? And concerning his *Tendenz*, isn't it an irony for T.'s thesis that Luke-Acts is a kind of salvation-history that legitimates the male apostolate? (Quite a contrast to Mark, where the true followers are women and the Twelve are benighted!)

As for the vocative *abba*, "father", which is ascribed to Jesus in Mark 14,36 par, modern Christian exegesis may have read its own theological assumptions into the word. It is the case that in modern Hebrew *abba* means "Daddy", and perhaps it was used that way in Aramaic. However, in the context of Mark's employment of the word, both the Marcan version of Jesus' agony in Gethsemane and the tradition of the LXX and Targum sug-

gest an emphasis on *obedience* — obedience, indeed, of a son who loves his father, but this obedience carries with it more of a connotation of a devoted son's submission to the command of parental authority than affectionate intimacy. (See J. Grassi, "Abba, Father [Mark 14:36]: Another Approach", *JAAR* 50 [1982] 449-458.)

When T. returns to God as Father in the final chapter, he makes a nice statement about the biblical metaphor as an image of the caring creator and redeemer that includes the motif of motherly compassion in nurture (221). Nonetheless, the biblical foundation of his conclusion is seriously flawed.

A basic problem with T.'s approach, particularly to the New Testament, is that he is caught between text and history or literary criticism and historical criticism. That is, he is a sophisticated exegete with fine aesthetic sensibilities, yet he vacillates, apparently without awareness at times, between focusing on the author's or text's point of view and focusing on the putative historical referents of the text. The latter are not always there, or not there in the form the text pretends. T. is sensitive to this in approaching Genesis and the Song of Songs, but he treats Luke as though the text is simply a sign pointing to historical figures and events.

The best way I have found to mediate between properly literary and properly historical concerns is to utilize the concept of "historicity" as this has come through the Heidegger-Bultmann tradition to the work of Paul Ricoeur. Briefly and roughly stated, historicity is *care* as it expresses itself in human occupation with the past and the future. Historicity provides an opening from history to the text in that the latter comes out of the concerns of particular authors and editors in a historical situation; but also an opening from text to history, in that dealing with history takes many forms, some of them "fictional". I have discussed historicity as a methodological concept in *Women Recounted* (Sheffield 1982) 27-28 and *Gospel Against Parable* (Decatur and Sheffield 1985) 12-13.

The advantage of this sort of approach that seeks to mediate between the literary-textual and historical-referential is that one is able both to acknowledge honestly the inferior status of women in most of the times and settings of biblical history and yet affirm the inspiration of metaphors and symbols that give the female and the feminine an essential place in covenant, language, and selfhood. For example, the archetypal tales of biblical women may tell us little about the "history" of Israel but much about Israel as a historical people of the covenant with the transcendent God.

In conclusion, some parts of this book are valuable in their own right. T. is at his best in analysing the human "lust for self-deification" (25-27) and surveying the texts dealing with divine wisdom (chs. 6 and 7). Moreover, it is important that someone of his stature seeks to provide critical support for the worth and work of women as equal to that of men in the church. However, the argument itself is methodologically lacking, especially in the New Testament sources.

Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244-1170

James G. WILLIAMS

Novum Testamentum

Jan LAMBRECHT, *Ich aber sage euch*. Die Bergpredigt als programmatische Rede Jesu (Mt 5-7; Lk 6,20-49). Übersetzt aus dem Niederländischen von Leo Hug. 252 S. mit Beilage des Textes. Stuttgart 1984. Katholisches Bibelwerk. DM 32,—.

In einem einleitenden Kapitel werden einige Typen von Interpretationen vorgestellt, wird die matthäische Bergpredigt und die lukanische Feldrede in ihrem Kontext und ihrer Struktur gezeigt und wird der Inhalt dieser Rede in Q und eine mögliche jesuanische Bergpredigt erschlossen. Das zweite Kapitel gilt den Seligpreisungen bei Jesus, in Q, bei Matthäus und Lukas und ihrer Aktualisierung für den heutigen Christen. Vier weitere Kapitel befassen sich mit der Bergpredigt des Matthäus: die Antithesen (5,17-48), Selbstdarstellung in der Öffentlichkeit und Gebet (6,1-18), Unbesorgtheit und Engagement (6,19-7,12), der Weg zum Leben (7,13-27). Diese Gliederung zeigt auch, wie L. den Aufbau der Bergpredigt sieht. Ein letztes Kapitel ist der lukanischen Feldrede gewidmet. In dem Epilog "Ich werde ihr Gott sein, und sie werden mein Volk sein" wird der Vasallenvertrag des Alten Orient und sein möglicher formgebender Einfluß auf Texte des AT und NT beschrieben. Von dort her wird eine Methode vorgestellt, wie die Lebenserneuerung bei Exerzitien in eine biblisch inspirierte, ansprechende und verbindliche Form gebracht werden kann.

Die Arbeit versteht sich nicht als eine Untersuchung, die wissenschaftliches Neuland erschließen will. Sie verzichtet auf Anmerkungen, nennt aber im Text selber die Autoren, mit denen diskutiert wird oder von denen wichtige Gedanken übernommen werden. Jedem Kapitel folgen ausführliche Literaturangaben von insgesamt 18 Seiten. Das Buch stellt eine klar gegliederte und gute Synthese aus vielen Untersuchungen dar mit wertvollen eigenen Beobachtungen. Es hat eine verständliche Sprache und vermittelt die biblischen Aussagen dem Christen in seiner heutigen Situation. Die Übersetzung ist wohl gelungen; an manchen Stellen, z.B. 173.176.179 würde man wohl besser 'Gericht' statt 'Urteil' sagen. Das besondere Interesse von L. gilt der Struktur der Texte und ihrer verschiedenen Gestalt und Akzentuierung, die sie bei Matthäus und Lukas haben und in Q und bei Jesus wohl gehabt haben. Auf den hypothetischen Charakter dieser erschlossenen Textformen wird immer wieder hingewiesen. Bei diesen Erschließungen ist L. in seinem Element. Ohne Gewalt, mit viel Spürsinn und Geschick erarbeitet er die vorausliegenden Textformen und mit viel Sensibilität stellt er die den verschiedenen Textformen je eigene Aussage dar. Als Synthese und als Beispiel für gekonntes methodisches Vorgehen hat die Arbeit einen eigenständigen Wert. Demgegenüber tritt die Auslegung des Inhalts der uns bei Matthäus und Lukas vorliegenden Texte zum Teil stark zurück. Wie L. selber sagt, will er "keine vollständige Detailexegese" bieten (97). Man darf also von dem Buch keine Gesamtauslegung der Texte erwarten. Das Recht einer solchen Auswahl

und Akzentuierung soll nicht bestritten werden. Manchmal fragt man sich aber, ob die inhaltliche Seite nicht zu kurz gekommen ist. So werden etwa die in den matthäischen Seligpreisungen genannten Gruppen und Verheißungen eher dürftig erklärt (61 s), wird bei der Behandlung von 6,1-18 (117-140) auf Almosen und Fasten nicht eingegangen, wird für 6,19-24 die Behandlung des Gedankengangs angekündigt (165), während die redaktionskritischen Erörterungen wieder das Übergewicht bekommen, wird das Problem einer 'massa damnata' bei 7,13s nicht berührt (183s). Natürlich kann man über die Notwendigkeit solcher näheren Ausführungen verschiedener Meinung sein. Die Beispiele sollen nur zeigen, wie in der Arbeit das Interesse am Inhalt der einzelnen Verse zurücktritt.

Es wird oft strittig sein, welche Texte enger zusammengehören. Die enge und gleichsam exklusive Verbindung von Mt 5,13-16 mit 5,3-12 (63s) und von 5,17-20 mit 5,21-48 (77) scheint mir problematisch zu sein. Die beiden Abschnitte dürften eine fundamentale und allgemeine Bedeutung in der Bergpredigt haben. In 5,13-16 wird die Aufgabe der Jünger im Hinblick auf die Welt umfassend festgelegt: Durch ihre guten Werke sollen sie Salz und Licht sein. Was diese guten Werke sind, wird nicht nur durch die ersten Glieder der Seligpreisungen erläutert (64), sondern gerade auch durch die ganze folgende Bergpredigt. In 5,17-19 klärt Jesus grundlegend seine Stellung zum Gesetz und in 5,20 ebenso das Ungenügen der pharisäischen Gerechtigkeit. Konkretisiert wird diese Stellung zum Gesetz und die wahre Gerechtigkeit nicht nur in 5,21-48, sondern in der ganzen folgenden Bergpredigt. Für diesen Bezug von 5,17-20 auf die ganze Bergpredigt spricht auch, daß 5,17 und 7,12 zurecht als eine Inklusion angesehen werden (27s.144) und daß die in 5,20 angesprochene Gerechtigkeit auch in 6,1.33 genannt und in Mt 6 auch erläutert wird. Es scheint mir sachgemäßer zu sein, 5,13-16 und 5,17-20 nicht zu eng mit dem Vorausgehenden und Folgenden zu verbinden, sondern in ihnen einen Abschnitt von Grundsatzaussagen zu sehen, der zwischen den vorausgehenden und nachfolgenden Konkretisierungen steht und auf die Bergpredigt insgesamt bezogen ist. Diskutabel ist auch die Zuordnung von Lk 6,36 (197s.200). Lk 6,27 und 6,35 sind sicher als Inklusion anzusehen. Die Frage ist, ob 6,36 noch an 6,35 anzufügen ist oder ob es in Verbindung mit der in 6,35 genannten Gotteskindschaft den Abschnitt 6,37-45 einleitet und seinen Rahmen absteckt. Daß Mt 5,48 sicher das Vorausgehende abschließt, darf die Gliederung des Lukastextes nicht bestimmen; sie muß aus diesem selbst gewonnen werden. Wenn nach der Einleitung "Ihr habt gehört, daß zu den Alten gesagt worden ist" unmittelbar der Dekalog (Mt 5,21.27) oder ein anderes Schriftwort zitiert wird, kann man das Subjekt des Sagens nicht in früheren Schriftgelehrten (89) sehen, sondern wird an Gott oder Mose nicht vorbeikommen. Bei den Ausführungen zu Mt 5,32, wonach "einige ernsthafte Moraltheologen" meinen, daß "in einer total mißlungenen Ehe... auch das Band und die Realität der Ehe selbst nicht mehr besteht" (98), würde man gerne eine genauere Begründung erfahren. An anderer Stelle wird die in der Bergpredigt verlangte Gerechtigkeit als Imperativ verstanden, "der allgemein gültig und absolut verpflichtend ist" (107; vgl. 207). Mt 5,48 wird in der gleichen verkürzenden Art wie in der Einheitsübersetzung wiedergegeben, wo entgegen dem griechischen Text das eigentliche Richtmaß, das Vollkommen-

sein Gottes, nicht genannt und durch ein 'es' ersetzt wird (89). In dem Zitat von Ez 36,22 fehlt "entweicht" (130).

Tschurtschenthalerst. 7
A-6020 Innsbruck
Austria

Kl. Stock

J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (The Anchor Bible 28). p. xxvi-837. Garden City, N.Y. 1981. Doubleday and Co.; *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* (The Anchor Bible 28A). p. 838-1642. Garden City, N.Y. 1985. Doubleday and Co.

Der umfangreiche Kommentar des katholischen Exegeten, der vor allem durch seine Studien zu aramäischen Texten und den Rollen von Qumran bekannt ist, zeigt im allgemeinen die gängige Gliederung der Anchor Bible-Kommentare. Im Unterschied zu anderen geht aber F. in seiner großangelegten "Introduction" sehr ausführlich auf die Theologie des Lukasevangeliums ein und stellt er den Kommentarteil ("Comment") jeweils den Einzelerklärungen ("Notes") voran. Schon daran zeigt sich ein wichtiger Akzent dieses Werkes: F. begnügt sich nicht mit der Klärung exegetischer Einzelfragen (z. B. Tradition, Redaktion und Historizität); sein Hauptinteresse gilt der Aussage des Textes (6): Was hat Lukas geschrieben? Warum hat er es geschrieben? Warum wurden diese Texte in den Kanon aufgenommen? Diese Besonderheit des Kommentars ergibt sich aus der den Autor leitenden Grundauffassung vom LkEv, die er in der "Introduction" eingehend begründet, wobei er sich kritisch mit vielen neueren Untersuchungen auseinandersetzt.

So möchte nach F. der Verfasser von Lk-Apg nicht historische Sicherheit, sondern die Zuverlässigkeit (*asphaleia*) der kirchlichen Unterweisung vermitteln, besonders durch den Nachweis ihrer Verankerung im Alten Bund und im Wirken Jesu, nicht zuletzt — was oft kaum beachtet wird — dank ihrer Vermittlung durch Petrus und Paulus (8-11). Gegenüber dem Vorwurf, Lukas habe das Kerygma durch die Geschichte ersetzt, vertritt F., daß Lukas das Kerygma lediglich den Anforderungen seiner Zeit entsprechend auf andere Weise als Paulus niedergeschrieben habe (12f; vgl. 145-162). Betreffs des Geschichtswertes zeigt F., daß Lukas zwar wie viele Historiker der Antike durchaus am Hergang der Ereignisse interessiert war, dieses geschichtliche Interesse allerdings dem theologischen unterordnete, sodaß aus seiner *diegesis* heute oft nicht mehr der historische Verlauf erschlossen werden kann (14-18; vgl. 172-178). Sehr viele Angaben sind aus heutiger Sicht sogar als fiktive Darstellungen zu beurteilen. Bei den Einzelerklärungen erinnert F. die mit einer solchen Deutung nicht vertrauten Leser (z. B. 342; 1560) an die im Vorwort bereits (viii) angeführte Unterscheidung von drei Stadien der Evangelienentstehung (Jesus, Urkirche, Evangelist), ohne allerdings auf die Rezep-

tion dieser Unterscheidung in *Dei Verbum* (Vat. II) ausdrücklich einzugehen. Hinsichtlich der 1k Auffassung von Heilsgeschichte und Eschatologie stimmt F. mit einigem Vorbehalt der Periodisierung Conzelmanns (Israel, Jesus, Kirche) zu, weist aber entschieden den Vorwurf zurück, die Heilsgeschichte sei für Lukas ein Ersatz der Eschatologie (18-22; vgl. 179-191). Diesbezüglich wie auch betreffs des Vorwurfs einer Ablösung der *theologia crucis* durch eine *theologia gloriae* (22-23; vgl. 219-221; 1360), des Etiketts "Frühkatholizismus" (23-27) und der landläufigen Gegenüberstellung "Lukas und Paulus" (27-29) warnt F. davor, die 1k Aussagen einzig an Sprache und Theologie des Paulus als einziger Norm zu messen.

Eine Überprüfung der neuzeitlichen Diskussion über den Verfasser von Lk-Apg führt F. (z. T. unter Berufung auf R. Glover) zu folgendem Ergebnis: Dieser war vermutlich ein aus Antiochien stammender Syrer (Heide) aus semitischem Milieu (45), der in hellenistischer Atmosphäre aufwuchs; er ist Phlm 24; Kol 4,14; 2 Tim 4,11 gemeint und war wohl wenigstens zeitweise ein Begleiter des Paulus (nicht aber während der Zeit, als dessen Hauptbriefe entstanden, die Lukas unbekannt geblieben sind). Die genaue Klärung des Verhältnisses zwischen Lukas und Paulus ist allerdings nach F. für die Auslegung von Lk weniger relevant (53). Gegenüber neueren Versuchen (etwa J. A. T. Robinson) verteidigt F., daß Lk erst nach der Zerstörung Jerusalems außerhalb Palästinas geschrieben wurde (53-57) und sich vornehmlich an Heidenchristen richtete (57-59).

F. akzeptiert mit einigen Modifikationen die Zweiquellentheorie. Außer Mk und Q (auf neuere Hypothesen zur Unterscheidung verschiedener Schichten von Q geht F. nicht ein) hat s. E. Lukas noch eine dritte Quelle benützt, deren Charakter sich aber nicht näher bestimmen läßt. Gegenüber einer schriftlichen Fassung von SLk (82-85) bleibt F. — anders als z. B. Schürmann — skeptisch, ebenso gegenüber einer besonderen Vorlage für den Passionsbericht (1365-1366) und einem Proto-Lk (89-91). Mit R. E. Brown rechnet F. nicht damit, daß der Verfasser des vierten Evangeliums das Lk kannte, wohl aber mit Traditionen, die beide benützten. Im einzelnen unterscheidet F. zwischen "redaction" (Überarbeitung einer vorgegebenen Tradition) und "composition" (eigene Gestaltung des Evangelisten). Um die Kompositionsweise des Lk, auf die F. bei der Erklärung der einzelnen Abschnitte jeweils eingeht, besser zu erhellen, stellt er in einem eigenen Abschnitt die sprachlichen und stilistischen Eigenheiten des Lk übersichtlich zusammen (107-127); dabei kommt F. hinsichtlich der mehrfachen Semitismen zum Ergebnis, daß diese weithin aus der LXX stammen (einige Aramaismen gehen auf den im syrischen Antiochen des Lukas gesprochenen aramäischen Dialekt zurück [116]). Textkritisch bewertet F. mit den Herausgebern der neuesten Ausgabe von Nestle-Aland den P⁷⁵ sehr hoch und plädiert darum auch für die Authentizität der sogenannten "Western-non-Interpolations" (131; im ersten Band lag F. die 26. Auflage von Nestle-Aland noch nicht vor; er folgt ihr hingegen im zweiten Band).

Gegenüber einer verbreiteten Vernachlässigung bzw. Unterbewertung der Theologie des Lukas (viele Werke begnügen sich mit Jesus, Paulus und Johannes) und den s. E. letztlich unzureichenden Versuchen von Flender, Franklin sowie Conzelmann plädiert F. für größere Wertschätzung (143f). In neun

Abschnitten behandelt er ausgiebig die für Lk-Apg charakteristischen theologischen Akzente, vom Lk Kerygma angefangen bis hin zum Lk Jesusbild (145-270). Besondere Beachtung verdienen dabei die Darlegungen F.s zur Lk Christologie (192-226) mit einer weitausholenden Behandlung der christologischen Titel *Messias*, *Kyrios*, *Retter*, *Sohn Gottes*, *Menschensohn*, *Knecht*, *Prophet*, *König* sowie der selteneren *Sohn Davids*, *Führer*, *Heiliger*, *Gerechter*, *Richter*, *Lehrer*. (Daß Lukas sogar den Titel "Gott" auf Christus beziehen konnte [8,39; 9,43; vgl. Apg 20, 28], schließt F. nicht gänzlich aus.) Bei diesen Erörterungen erweist sich die vorangestellte Unterscheidung von vier Phasen der Existenz Christi als sehr hilfreich: 1. seit der jungfräulichen Empfängnis; 2. von der Taufe bis zur Himmelfahrt; 3. von der Himmelfahrt bis zur Parusie; 4. bei der Parusie (196f). So ist z. B. der ursprünglich der vierten Phase zustehende Titel *Kyrios* (vgl. "Maranatha") bei Lukas zwar vornehmlich Titel des Auferstandenen, wird aber oft auch in das irdische Leben Jesu zurückdatiert (201ff). Daß Lukas entgegen einem gängigen Vorurteil die Heilsbedeutung des Todes Jesu nicht unbekannt war, findet F. (unter Berufung auf Georges) u. a. in folgendem angedeutet (219f): Nur Lukas zeichnet Jesus als leidenden *Messias*, der sterben "muß" (z. B. 13,33; 17,25; Apg 13,28-30) und in dessen Name die Vergebung der Sünden gepredigt wird (24,46f); als einziger Synoptiker überliefert Lukas das Abendmahlswort "mein Leib, der für euch hingegeben wird" (22,19) und die Heilszusage an den Schächer in der Todesstunde Jesu (23,43).

Bei der Kommentierung der einzelnen Abschnitte geht F. meist von redaktions- und traditionskritischen Beobachtungen aus, läßt dann eine formkritische Beurteilung und schließlich die Erklärung der Aussage des jeweiligen Abschnitts folgen. Wo einzelne Texte es verlangen (z. B. die Kindheitsevangelen), behandelt F. mutig und ausgewogen die sich für heutige Leser ergebenden Probleme. Mitunter geht er etwas apologetisierend auf Fragen katholischer Leser ein. (S. 338 gesteht F., daß er in Lk 1,35 — anders als in einem früheren Beitrag — den Gedanken der Jungfrauengeburt ausgesprochen findet, wenn auch nicht so offen wie Mt 1,18ff [vgl. 193].) Sehr aufschlußreich sind die in den "Notes" gegebenen Einzelerklärungen, zumal F. dort aus seiner gründlichen Kenntnis des Aramäischen und der Schriften von Qumran viele neue Aspekte zur Erhellung des biblischen Textes einbringen kann. (Im Rahmen einer Rezension kann darauf wie auf die Auslegung der einzelnen Abschnitte leider nicht eingegangen werden.)

Außer dem Kapitel "Selected Bibliography" (271-283) stellt F. — wie er gegenüber dem Rezensenten beteuerte, ohne Computer! — im Anschluß an die einzelnen Abschnitte jeweils die wichtigste neuere Literatur zusammen. Ein Autoren- und ein Sachregister (1603-1646) schließen das Werk ab.

Durch die kritische Aufarbeitung der fast unübersehbaren Fachliteratur, durch viele eigenständige Erklärungen und Einzelbeobachtungen hat F. allen Auslegern des Lk einen wertvollen Dienst erwiesen. In den meisten Fällen kann er mit Zustimmung der Fachkollegen rechnen, mögen manche auch wie der Rezensent in einigen Punkten anderer Auffassung sein (z. B. Verhältnis Lukas-Paulus, Nichtauthentizität von Lk 22,43f, Erklärung von *anestē* als Ausdruck für Auferstehung aus eigener Kraft [195], das F.s sonstiger Offenheit entgegenstehende Bemühen, mehrere rein fiktive Angaben noch als ir-

gendwie historisch zu bewerten [etwa 1389; 1430; 1479]). Die erst während der jahrelangen Ausarbeitung dieses Kommentars langsam akzeptierte Einsicht vom Vorrang der synchronischen Textanalyse vor einer diachronischen könnte aus der Sicht des Rezensenten noch mehr zu Hauptanliegen F.s, der Erhellung der Textaussage selbst beitragen. — Möge dieser ausgezeichnete, große Lk-Kommentar, auf Jahre hinaus ein Standardwerk, schließlich viele dazu anregen, noch im einzelnen zu klären, wie Lukas den Theophilus und heutige Leser durch so viele (auch nach F.) fiktive Schilderungen von der "Zuverlässigkeit" der kirchlichen Verkündigung (vgl. 1,4) überzeugen kann.

Boltzmanngasse 9
A-1090 Wien

Jacob KREMER

Charles Homer GIBLIN, *The Destruction of Jerusalem according to Luke's Gospel: A Historical-Typological Moral* (Analecta Biblica 107). x-123 p. Rome 1985. Biblical Institute Press.

Giblin's study affords a fine example of erudite biblical scholarship. This small book treats a theme of major theological significance, and abounds in critical insight. The reader is not left dangling in suspense; rather, he is informed of the book's conclusion in the Preface, with the result that the development of the study is followed with ease. (This is a practice that I think more scholars should follow.) Giblin's thesis is simple enough: (1) The evangelist Luke tries to show that Jerusalem is destroyed because its "people are insensitive to the terms for peace" (p. viii; p. 105: "failure to recognize the time of their visitation") and because its rulers (Roman and Jewish, though primarily the latter) are unjust (particularly with respect to their treatment of Jesus). (2) Luke's point in developing this thesis is to serve notice to his readership, to men of "affluence and influence" (as concluded from his study of the Lucan preface [1,1-4]; see pp. 10-18, 106), that if they treat the disciples and proclaimers of Jesus as Jesus himself was treated by the rulers of Jerusalem, whose city was destroyed, they may anticipate a similar judgment to fall upon them and their cities as well. Such a presentation, Giblin informs us, may be described as "historical-typological" (p. viii). The object of such a moral typology is to stimulate thoughtful reflection on the part of the reader (see also p. 104).

The first point seems to be well taken, and comports well with other Lucan studies. The second point, however, is less convincing. It is less convincing not because of faulty exegesis, but because it relies more heavily upon intuition than evidence. Nevertheless I suspect that Giblin may very well be on the right track. (Perhaps the most persuasive element of his presentation in this regard is his exegesis of 23,26-32.)

Of major importance to his thesis is his outline of Luke and his interpretation of the significance of the major components of his outline. Giblin divides the gospel into three major divisions of Jesus' adult ministry: 3,1-9,50; 9,51-19,27; 19,28-24,53. Luke's view of the fate of Jerusalem is

developed in the second and third divisions. (In the first division the city of Jerusalem figures prominently as the Jewish religious center, but there is not one hint of its fate.) In the second division (9,51–19,27) a few ominous passages appear; but it is in the third division (19,28–24,53) that the grim fate of the city of Jerusalem is finally spelled out. Giblin's outline makes sense, and his assessment of the emphases of its individual parts on the whole appears to be well founded.

Although 9,51 begins the second major division of Jesus' adult ministry, a section that hints of Jerusalem's impending fate, Giblin does not see in this verse ("[Jesus] set his face to go to Jerusalem") any sense of foreboding (pp. 31–32), as I had suggested in this journal a few years ago (*Bib* 63 [1982] 545–548). He states: "In line with Luke's forthright clarity of expression, the text demands and allows for nothing beyond an announcement of Jesus' firm determination to journey towards that city, which has not figured in his journeys before this point" (p. 32). This is debatable, but in either case his understanding of this part of Luke is unaffected. Giblin sees the evangelist Luke as gradually hinting at Jerusalem's fate in 9,51–19,27 (the second section) and then, in 19,28–23,31 (the third section), explicating this fate clearly. Passages in the second section that hint at Jerusalem's calamity would include 10,10–16; 13,1–5.31–35; 19,11–27. (He rejects Gaston's view [*No Stone on Another. Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (NovTSup 23; Leiden 1970) 352–353] that 17,37 alludes to the destruction of Jerusalem.) Most of these passages are either unique to Luke or have been extensively redacted. Similarly, all the passages in the third section concerned with Jerusalem's fate are either unique to Luke (such as 19,41–45; 23,26–32) or heavily redacted by the evangelist (such as 21,20–24). This fact alone suggests that the destruction of Jerusalem was of major interest to this evangelist.

It struck me as curious, however, that Giblin did not make more use of 13,1–5 in developing what he believes to be the moral that Luke intends for his readers (especially in connection with his discussion of 23,26–32). The whole point of the allusions to those killed by Pilate and those killed by the tower is that if such judgment falls on men who have not committed any particularly grievous sin, how much more severe will judgment be upon those of Jesus' generation who refuse to repent. As in the reference to the green and dry wood of 23,31, the argument here also in *a minore ad maius*, and serves as further warning to Luke's audience.

Nonetheless, throughout this monograph Giblin's exegesis is careful and persuasive. The reader is left at every turn with the impression that Giblin allows the text to speak for itself. I can find little with which I disagree.

A potential objection to Giblin's thesis, however, is the observation that Jerusalem enjoys a very positive role in the Book of Acts. Nowhere is the destruction of Jerusalem predicted or alluded to. Rather, the city remains the center of Judaism, and becomes the center of the newly-established Christian faith. Aware of this, Giblin devotes a brief appendix to this problem (pp. 108–112). He examines Stephen's speech (Acts 7,2–60), viewing it as an instance of "a prophetic-apocalyptic counter-indictment of disregard for God and Moses" (p. 111). Although the temple is not explicitly attacked, her reli-

gious guardians are condemned for their idolatrous reverence for the cult-center (see pp. 111-112). In my view, the most probable explanation is simply that Luke has written Acts with completely different purposes in mind. It simply is not necessary to assume that an author must continue a theme throughout all of his work. In the gospel he wished to elaborate on the significance of Jerusalem's destruction, while in Acts he had no such concern. One thing that is emphatically continued in the evangelist's second volume is the negative portrayal of Jerusalem's religious leadership. Perhaps the most relevant text to consider is Acts 17,24 (cited by Giblin, but not discussed) where the Lucan Paul declares to the Athenians: "God... does not live in shrines made by man". This comment, understood in the context of the entire Acts account, only underscores God's movement away and beyond a fixed place of worship. The shift from Jerusalem to Rome, although not in itself portending the city's destruction, would at least hint at Jerusalem's demise as a religious center. On the other hand, since Jerusalem itself becomes in Acts the early center for Christianity, emphasis upon the theme of this city's destruction would probably have worked against the overall purpose for the Book of Acts. The Christian presence in that city should be seen as serving to provide a blessing for the city. In any case, however the absence in Acts of the idea of Jerusalem's destruction is to be explained, Giblin's thesis is not seriously threatened.

As to the question of how the evangelist Luke relates to the Jewish people, Giblin's exegesis is preferable to that recently developed by J. T. Sanders. The latter has argued that the evangelist Luke is anti-Semitic and has "written off" the Jews (see, among other studies, "The Parable of the Pounds and Lucan Anti-Semitism", *TS* 42 [1981]). On the contrary, Acts 3,20 implies that conversion, primarily personal rather than national, is both a possibility and a hope (cf. Giblin, pp. 89-91). For the city of Jerusalem itself, of course, there is no hope of restoration or conversion. Luke wishes to show that failure to recognize God's visitation and the concomitant rejection of his Son Jesus will result in certain catastrophe. In this depiction, however, there is no hint of "Jesus' personal hostility to the inhabitants of the city" (p. 105). I might add that there is no hint of personal hostility on the part of the evangelist Luke either. The Jewish religious leadership has as a whole rejected Jesus and the Christian preaching, hence the mission to the Gentiles (so Acts), but the evangelist views all free to repent and come to faith in Jesus.

Giblin concludes: "If the new interpretation offered here contributes to a fuller understanding of the unity, coherence, and over-all individual and personal relevance of Luke's Gospel, and helps to exclude some faulty, short-sighted views, it will amply have served its purpose" (p. 107). I believe that Giblin's work has indeed achieved this purpose.

Trinity Western University
7600 Glover Road
Langley, British Columbia
Canada V3A 4R9

Craig A. EVANS

Philippe ROLLAND, *Les premiers évangiles. Un nouveau regard sur le problème synoptique* (Lectio Divina 116). 260 p. Paris 1984. Les Éditions du Cerf. FF 139.

Die Arbeit ist in drei Teilen aufgebaut. Ein erster Teil zeigt die Mängel der klassischen Lösungsvorschläge für das synoptische Problem (Griesbachhypothese, Urevangelium, Zwei-Quellen-Theorie). Im zweiten Teil wird eine neue Lösung erarbeitet. Sie ist der Zwei-Quelle-Theorie ähnlich, insofern sie für den Mt und Lk gemeinsamen Stoff auch ein zusammenhängendes Dokument annimmt. Dieses wird 'Evangelium der Gottesfürchtigen' genannt und soll in Cäsarea am Meer entstanden sein. Ihm wird ein universalistischer Charakter zuerkannt. Sie unterscheidet sich von der Zwei-Quellen-Theorie, indem sie drei Schriften annimmt, die Markus vorausliegen und von denen die drei synoptischen Evangelien in verschiedener Weise abhängen. Im genauen Vergleich von Mt und Mk wird das ihnen gemeinsame Material ermittelt. Die Schrift, die sich daraus ergibt, wird 'Hellenistisches Evangelium' genannt. Auch sie ist universalistisch ausgerichtet, soll dem Kreis um Stephanus nahe stehen und nach dessen Vertreibung aus Jerusalem in Antiochien entstanden sein. Das Material, das sich als dem Mk und Lk gemeinsam erweist, wird als 'Paulinisches Evangelium' bezeichnet, das in Philippi oder Ephesus entstanden sein soll. Der umfangreiche Stoff, der dem Hellenistischen und Paulinischen Evangelium gemeinsam ist und der sich entsprechend in allen synoptischen Evangelien findet, macht das 'Evangelium der Zwölf' aus, das jüdenchristlichen Charakter habe und bald nach dem Tod und der Auferstehung Jesu in Jerusalem entweder in Hebräisch oder Aramäisch verfaßt wurde. Am Anfang der Evangelienschreibung stehe dieses Evangelium der Zwölf. Den Bedürfnissen der christlichen Mission entsprechend ist es in Antiochien und Philippi (Ephesus) erweitert worden. Diese beiden Erweiterungen lagen Markus vor und aus ihnen hat er sein Evangelium zusammengestellt. Matthäus verfaßte sein Evangelium auf der Basis des Hellenistischen Evangeliums und des Evangeliums der Gottesfürchtigen; dazu kam sein Sondergut. Auch Lukas ging vom Evangelium der Gottesfürchtigen aus; dazu kam aber das Paulinische Evangelium und das Sondergut. Das heutige Markusevangelium ist also weder für Matthäus noch Lukas Quelle gewesen; die Gemeinsamkeiten rühren von den vorausliegenden gemeinsamen Quellen her. — Der dritte Teil befaßt sich mit den Theorien von Vaganay, Gaboury und Boismard. Ein Anhang stellt knapp weitere neun Autoren und ihre Stellungnahmen zum synoptischen Problem vor.

Die Arbeit ist sehr informativ. Klar und übersichtlich werden die verschiedenen Seiten des synoptischen Problems und seiner Lösungsvorschläge dargestellt; Gründe und Gegengründe sind sorgfältig abgewogen. Die Theorie von R. ist interessant, nicht zu simpel und nicht zu kompliziert und muß bei allen weiteren Überlegungen berücksichtigt werden. Sie geht über das bloß Literarische hinaus und versucht die gerschlossenen Dokumente in die Entwicklung und das Leben der Urkirche einzuordnen. Gerade hier hat aber vieles einen spekulativen und unsicheren Charakter. Wie R. selbst ausführt (S.247), besteht seine Grundüberzeugung darin, daß ein Evangelist aus einer

ihm vorliegenden Quelle möglichst alles aufnimmt und nichts ausläßt. Es seien keine Gründe zu sehen, warum er vorhandene, wertvolle und zuverlässige Überlieferung beiseite lassen soll. Von diesem Prinzip ist das Erschließen der Quellen und die Konzeption vom Entstehen der Evangelien beherrscht. Nun dürfte aber Jo 20,30 ein Hinweis darauf sein, daß wenigstens Johannes nur eine Auswahl der Zeichen Jesu berichtet und von weiteren Zeichen Kenntnis hatte. Es scheint also doch das Phänomen des Auslassens zu geben. Der Hinweis darauf, daß die weiteren Zeichen Johannes möglicherweise nicht schriftlich überliefert waren, dürfte nicht weit tragen. Um ein einzelnes Beispiel zu nennen: Wenn Markus von der Bußpredigt des Täufers nichts bringt, sondern nur die Ankündigung des nachfolgenden Stärkeren berichtet (1,7-8), so scheint der einzige mögliche Grund dafür nicht der zu sein, daß ihm über die Bußpredigt keine Überlieferung vorlag. Er kann sich auch absichtlich auf die Verkündigung des Täufers über Jesus beschränkt haben; dies fügt sich dem Grundzug seines Evangeliums, die Identität Jesu herauszuarbeiten, ein. Im Johannesevangelium kommt die Bezeichnung 'Täufer' nicht vor; die Darstellung des Johannes ist ganz auf seine Zeugenschaft für Jesus konzentriert. Es scheint also, daß ein Evangelist auch von anderen Motiven als von dem einer möglichst vollständigen Weitergabe der ihm vorliegenden Tradition geleitet sein kann. Auch sonst scheint R. der Gefahr zu erliegen, andere Möglichkeiten zu schnell und ohne wirkliche Begründungen auszuschließen. Wenn im Hinblick auf Mk 6,7-30 und Lk 9,1-10 gesagt wird, daß die Gedankenfolge bei Lukas besser sei als bei Markus (S.97), würde man gerne erfahren, nach welchen Kriterien sich dieses 'besser' bemißt. Die chronologisch richtige Anordnung kann nicht als entscheidendes Kriterium genommen werden, da sie häufig nicht das bestimmende Gestaltungsprinzip ist (vgl. auch Lk 3,19-22). Mit dem Verweis darauf, daß die Salbung in Betanien nach Jo 12,1 sechs Tage und nach Mk 14,1 zwei Tage vor dem Pascha stattfindet, wird sie als sekundäre Einfügung des Markus qualifiziert, und wird Lukas die Bewahrung des ursprünglichen Grundtextes zuerkannt (S.98). Immerhin findet sich der Vorgang selber bei Johannes, wenn auch mit dieser Differenz im Datum, während ihn Lukas überhaupt nicht bringt. Wenn Mk 7,14-23 und Mk 2,23-28 unter dem Titel 'Auseinandersetzung über Speisen' und Mk 7,24-30 und Mk 5,1-17 unter dem Titel 'Heilung auf heidnischem Gebiet' subsumiert werden und jeweils als Dubletten ausgegeben werden (S.96f), dann muß dieses Vorgehen als gewaltsam erscheinen. Auch verliert der Begriff 'Dublette' fast jeden präzisen Gehalt, wenn er auf Vorgänge angewendet wird, die ein paar Berührungspunkte haben. Die Absicht, den Abschnitt Mk 6,45-8,26, der häufig als lukanische Auslassung (zwischen 9,10-17 und 9,18-21) bezeichnet wird, als markinische Einfügung zu erweisen und einen Großteil seines Stoffes als 'sekundär' zu qualifizieren, beherrscht zu sehr die Argumentation. Es ist auch nicht recht einzusehen, warum der "einfache und elegante" Text von Lk 20,10-15 ursprünglicher sein soll und Mk 12,2-8 eine ungeschickte Kombination von zwei Traditionen darstellen soll (S.101). Auch hier stellt sich die Frage nach den Kriterien. Insgesamt scheint mir die Argumentation für eine Markus und Lukas vorliegende gemeinsame Quelle (S.88-106) nicht sehr stark zu sein. In dem, was sie über das Evangelium der Zwölf hinaus enthalten soll, bleibt sie blaß und gesichtslos. Ihre Beziehung zum paulinischen Bereich

stützt sich auf eher schwache Gründe (S.153-157). Kann man über wenige terminologische Gemeinsamkeiten, wobei die Worte teils noch in einem anderen Zusammenhang und Sinn gebraucht werden, eine Beziehung beweisen? Wie läßt sich von Apg 16-16-18; 19,13-16 her für den Kreis um Paulus ein besonderes Interesse an Dämonenaustreibungen zeigen, wenn in den Briefen des Paulus nie davon gesprochen wird? Einige kleinere Versehen seien noch genannt: S.66 letzte Zeile muß es wohl 5-9 statt 5-8 heißen, S.89 erste Zeile Lc 6,20 statt 6,12, S.152 sechste Zeile von unten Marc statt Luc. — die Verdienste der Arbeit bleiben ungeschmälert. In der Diskussion des synoptischen Problems wird sie eine gewichtige Stimme sein.

Tschurtschenthalerst. 7
A-6020 Innsbruck
Austria

Kl. STOCK

-
- D. Moody SMITH, *Johannine Christianity: Essays on Its Setting, Sources, and Theology*. xix-233 p. Columbia, South Carolina 1984. University of South Carolina.

Johannine Christianity presents the reader with a preface, an introduction, and nine chapters originally published previously in various scholarly journals and books. Only the preface (which is a significant part of the book) is original to this book. (The last chapter has undergone some editing.) The studies range over a period of nearly two decades. Virtually all of the essays are concerned with the question of what sources underlie the fourth gospel. Most of the studies address themselves to this question exclusively, while the other studies, although concerned with other matters (such as christology and ecclesiology), refer to it as well. With the exception of the last chapter most of these studies are not exegetical strictly speaking. Since these essays were written over a period of many years as separate papers, it is natural that there should be some overlap. However, in the present case it borders on tedium. At least a half dozen times the reader is provided a discussion of Bultmann's source theory and the subsequent scholarly debate. This is where some editing and updating would have made the volume read a little more smoothly and less repetitiously. Moreover, because the studies were originally written without reference to one another, the book suffers from a certain lack of transition, which from time to time is quite noticeable. For example, the conclusion of chapter seven ("The influence of the synoptics was at best secondary...", p. 170) is not presupposed in chapter eight, where the question of John's relationship to the synoptics appears to remain uncertain, at least less certain than it did in the previous chapter (see p. 180). The reason for this inconsistency is due to the fact that chapter eight originally appeared in 1977, while chapter seven appeared more recently in 1980. Nevertheless, the combination and arrangement of these studies make sense,

and as such, a useful and stimulating book, whatever its editorial deficiencies, emerges.

The book is narrower in its scope than its title implies. Smith makes no attempt to present a comprehensive and detailed picture of the nature and development of the Johannine community as does, say, Raymond E. Brown (*The Community of the Beloved Disciple* [New York 1979]) though one is able to catch glimpses of such now and then (see pp. 2-6, 12-22, 184-188, 209-220). Rather, Smith is chiefly interested in the question of John's relation to the synoptics and to whatever sources, oral or literary, to which he may have had access. Outside of chapters 1 and 9 the Johannine epistles are rarely mentioned. Even more rare is reference to the Apocalypse. (The reader will find these references with difficulty since the latter part of the Scripture index [pp. 229-33], from 1 Thessalonians to the Apocalypse, has apparently been accidentally omitted. The Author Index appears to be incomplete as well.)

The great strength of this book and, indeed, I believe its chief value, is Smith's ability to discern the trends of Johannine research in which the significant gains have been made. These trends fall into the following three areas: (1) Smith concludes that J. Louis Martyn's study, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (New York 1968), has succeeded in placing the fourth gospel into its appropriate historical and social setting, namely that of the late first-century synagogue and Pharisaic Judaism. Such a proposed setting, Smith notes, is not entirely at variance with Bultmann's views. Future discussion of the Johannine setting must take this thesis into account. (2) As to John's relationship to the synoptic gospels, Smith believes that the consensus of scholarship, Neirynck, de Solages, and others notwithstanding, has come to view the fourth gospel as literarily independent. This does not mean, however, that the fourth gospel was completely ignorant of them; it only means that he did not use one or more of them as sources as, for example, Matthew used Mark (or vice versa). Here I find Smith's discussion particularly thoughtful and nuanced. He avoids the logical fallacy of the excluded middle, instead exploring various options and possibilities that lie somewhere in between. (More on this below.) (3) Since the fourth gospel apparently has not made use of the synoptic gospels as sources, Smith believes that this gospel is dependent upon sources that have derived from a non-synoptic stream of tradition. This tradition does in a few places overlap with the synoptic tradition, but it should be viewed as essentially distinct from it. Bultmann's *semeai* source may very well have been a literary document from this distinctive tradition. Smith correctly observes that of the various literary sources proposed for the fourth gospel, only the *semeia* source has gained fairly wide acceptance. Again his assessment of scholarship in this area is careful, fair, and representative. My only point of disagreement in this area has to do with his ready acceptance of Robert T. Fortna's conclusion that the signs source included a primitive version of the passion (see his *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge 1970]). This view, from what I have observed, has received more criticism than it has acceptance. Nevertheless, Smith's discussion is quite helpful.

One disappointment in these studies is Smith's reluctance to deal deci-

sively with the arguments advanced by John R. Donahue (*Are You the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark* [SBLDS 10; Missoula 1973]) and Norman Perrin (*The New Testament: An Introduction* [New York 1974]) to the effect that traces of Marcan redaction appear in John, and therefore the conclusion that John knew and used Mark as at least one of his sources is inescapable (pp. 147, 160-163). Smith notes Fortna's criticism (p. 161, n. 26), which in my estimation has dealt Donahue's position a fatal blow (see Fortna, *NTS* 24 [1978] 371-383), but seems to take refuge in E. J. Pryke's study of Marcan redaction and style in which it is apparent that supposed "Marcan" material in John often lacks those elements thought to be characteristic of the evangelist Mark. (Some of Pryke's observations in this connection are revealing, but his methodology has not escaped serious criticism.) Smith rightly asks, "Is it redaction at all, or is it rather tradition?" (p. 163). (This is precisely the question. But Smith does not drive it home hard enough.) Donahue wishes to show that the intercalation of the traditions of Jesus inside before the High Priest, and Peter outside by the fire is specifically Marcan (See Mark 14). Naturally should this intercalation appear elsewhere (such as in the case of John 18), Donahue's thesis either collapses or he must explain the other appearance as due to dependence upon Mark. Not unexpectedly Donahue opts for the latter explanation. But this explanation rests heavily on several assumptions, some of which would include: (1) the assumption that John was written toward the end of the first century. This is probably correct, but some scholars have argued for much earlier dates (Klaus Wengst suggests the 80's, while John A. T. Robinson has argued for a pre-70 date). If John was written appreciably earlier then dependence on Mark becomes quite unlikely. (2) Donahue assumes that in the twenty or thirty years (or less!) between the publication of Mark and John the latter would have in all probability seen the former. But this assumes too much and in fact begs the question. It is clear that Mark became known in some Christian circles relatively quickly (as seen in its usage by Matthew and Luke), but the appearance of so much non-synoptic material in John suggests that this gospel emanated from a different, and quite possibly isolated, circle. (Or has Donahue unconsciously assumed the Ephesian tradition of the fourth gospel's origin?) (3) Finally, Donahue seems to assume that the fourth evangelist would have, or should have, attached special significance to Mark. But this assumes that in some sense Mark would have been viewed by John as authoritative (i.e., canonical in a primitive sense). But this seems highly unlikely, especially if one does argue that John knew and/or used Mark. For if this is granted, then the very fact that John has made so little use of Mark would suggest that the latter was not viewed as particularly authoritative or useful (unless, of course, one appeals to the traditional, and unconvincing, "supplemental" theory). Ultimately the question why the fourth evangelist made no more use of Mark than he did, if he indeed did have access to this gospel, seriously undermines efforts to prove dependence, a question which Smith himself raises (p. 148). Evidence for dependence cannot be circumstantial (such as a few inexact parallels and several assumptions), but substantial.

This is a profoundly significant issue for Johannine studies. For if John

knew Mark and possibly one or more of the other synoptics, we must then explain the fourth gospel with reference to why he chose to ignore and alter so much of the synoptic tradition before him. However, if he did not know (though he may have known *of* Mark (and the other synoptics), then we must examine his tradition as independent and ask how it is that it came to be similar in some ways and yet so vastly different in other ways. Smith favors Johannine independence, but appears to be overly cautious, and therefore reluctant to commit himself. For argument's sake let it be concluded that John is literarily independent of the synoptics and let us get on with the task of interpreting the fourth gospel from this perspective. Johannine scholars would welcome, and should expect, future studies by Professor Smith that will help work out some of the exegetical and theological implications of this position.

Trinity Western University
7600 Glover Road
Langley, British Columbia
Canada V3A 4R9

Craig A. EVANS

Donald A. HAGNER, *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus: An Analysis and Critique of Modern Jewish Study of Jesus*. With a foreword by Gösta Lindeskog (Academie Books). 341 p. 20x13.5. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1984. Zondervan.

On the surface, *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus* (which arrived for review in the editorial office of *Biblica* in mid-1986) is a fascinating book as it discusses the history of the attitudes of various Jewish scholars to Jesus Christ. Below the surface it is more fascinating still, for it proves unexpectedly effective in looking at familiar realities in unfamiliar ways.

The book is straightforward to a virtue. It begins by rehearsing briefly the current Jewish interest in Jesus (pp. 21-39). Then comes a tidy survey of the way Jews through the centuries have looked on Jesus (pp. 41-71). All very straightforward. But by this time it is becoming clear both to reader and author that one has to come to some agreement about what a "Gospel" is if the Gospels are to be used as the principal source for discussing Jesus. Hence an excursus on Gospel criticism (pp. 72-85). Here the author is somewhat less than successful in arguing that Christian faith does not distort the presentation of the historical Jesus. Chapter Three moves ahead with a discussion of Jesus' attitude toward the Law (pp. 87-132), "for the Jews are first and foremost the people of the Torah" (p. 87). Jesus' teaching comes next under inspection, since this is a main concern of modern Jewish scholarship with regard to his reclamation (pp. 133-170). Another excursus then intervenes (pp. 171-190) because of the need to reconcile the harsh criticism of the Pharisees by Jesus with the defense of the Pharisees by Jewish scholars; here

Hagner is persuasive as he argues that the two views can be reconciled. After a chapter on Jesus' religious teaching (pp. 191-216) comes another excursus (pp. 217-226) as Hagner focusses on the tendency to ignore or fail to explain "what does not fit the rabbinic Jewish framework" (p. 226) in Jewish attempts to come to grips with what he sees as the originality of Jesus. The way is thus prepared for a discussion of the mission of Jesus (pp. 227-271) and the conclusion (pp. 273-296).

As is clear, Hagner is not simply a conscientious chronicler; he is also a candid commentator. He interjects his own viewpoint into the proceedings and at more than one point sets the record straight as he sees it. His is an unabashedly conservative critique from an avowedly Christian standpoint (p. 85). For him the Gospels contain the sayings of Jesus which have been handed down "carefully and faithfully" (*ibid.*). Only if the evangelists' views are taken into account can full justice be done to the Gospels as they stand and to the figure of Jesus whom they delineate. This position is stated more than explained: the presentation is not really satisfactory. The reviewer concurs with Hagner's position but would like to see him (and his Jewish interlocutors) work at developing a clearer view of what a Gospel is than is possible in traditional historical criticism. What is needed is an understanding of the Gospels based on their Jewish origin, and until such an understanding is developed all discussion about the "Jewishness" of Jesus is going to remain unsatisfactory. The familiar reality of the Gospels needs looking at in the unfamiliar context of Jewish dialogue.

Hagner is not simply refreshingly candid; he is also reassuringly perceptive. He makes his own the view of T. W. Manson that "what Jesus offers in his ethical teaching is not a set of rules of conduct, but a number of illustrations of the way in which a transformed character will express itself in conduct" (p. 170). He argues convincingly that the New Testament is not anti-Semitic, although it is anti-Judaistic (pp. 288-292). And he ends his book by declaring that "Jesus the Jew is the Christ of Christianity without being any less a Jew; Jesus the Christ is fully a Jew without being any less the Christ of the church" (p. 296).

The last-mentioned position is another example of the advantages of looking at a familiar reality in an unfamiliar way. To say that "Jesus the Jew is the Christ of Christianity without being any less a Jew" has a nice rhetorical flourish about it and the reviewer suspects it is true, but how can it be explained in a way that makes sense? Once again Hagner leaves the reader unenlightened. Hagner thinks that Jesus is divine in the full sense of the word (p. 85). But if anything is clear about Hagner's survey of Jews who have written about Jesus, they do not regard him as divine. Their idea of being Jewish evidently precludes their regarding Jesus as ever having conceived of himself as divine in the full sense of the word, and a fortiori of having been divine.

For the reviewer, the only possible way of upholding Hagner's claim that Jesus is fully a Jew without being any less the Christ of the church seems to lie in showing that Jesus as divine transcends the framework of Judaism while at the same time, in a sense, remaining within it. For a human who walks the earth as Jesus did also to be divine in the full sense of the word

clearly transcends the framework of Judaism as it is normally conceived. (The whole question of Jesus' death eventually has to be faced; Hagner omits discussion of the trial and death on the grounds that it would have lengthened the book out of all manageable proportions. This is an understandable decision but one which results in a seriously deficient presentation of the problem of the Jewishness of Jesus.) The testimony of Jewish scholars is ample witness to the fact that they cannot reconcile their Jewishness with belief in Jesus' divinity. But the very fact that Judaism must be invoked to understand what transcendence involves implies that in a sense the divine Jesus still remains within its framework: Jesus is Jewishly divine.

How belief in the divinity of Jesus arose is a key question. Jewish scholars, when they discuss this question at all, tend to look on belief in the divinity of Jesus as a development which took place in the Gentile-Christian context of Hellenism (p. 255). But the "signs" which are invoked in the Gospels seem to belong to the framework of Judaism ("the sign of Jonah", for example) even if they transcend it (the risen Christ, for example). The question "what is a Gospel" has to be discussed more thoroughly if any agreement even to disagree is to be academically intelligible. The question "what is a Gospel" haunts Hagner's book.

Hagner claims that the Jewish attempts to reclaim Jesus for their own have been only "partially successful" (p. 295; "manifestly unsuccessful" on p. 15). And yet he claims that "Christ is fully a Jew without being any less the Christ of the church". Is this an implicit claim that Hagner could succeed where Jewish scholars have failed? If so, Hagner owes them and his fellow Christians another book.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

James SWETNAM, S.J.

Birger GERHARDSSON, *The Gospel Tradition* (Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series, 15). 57 p. 23x15.5. Malmö 1986. CWK Gleerup [Liber Förlag]. ISBN 91-40-05157-9.

"It is my conviction that historical research must try to make very *concrete* reconstructions of the past, preferably in the form of vivid, visual pictures of the complex realities. The sources do not always allow that. But we can often advance rather far in the right direction if we apply, on the one hand, general ("phenomenological") insights about the way in which human beings function both individually and communally, and, on the other hand, special insights from that historical sphere in which the object of research is situated and from the analogies closest to it".

Thus, with admirable clarity, the author on p. 11 of this short, provocative monograph. The concrete reconstruction Gerhardsson is aiming at, of course, is the way tradition functioned in early Christianity, especially with regard to the writing of the Gospels. His "phenomenological" model is drawn from "insights gained in many areas, times and disciplines". But these areas, times and disciplines are not explicitly presented and this lack gives the work a certain air of off-putting insouciance at the beginning. In constructing the model a distinction is made between "inner" and "outer" tradition. The former is the animating force of a tradition; the latter, the visible and audible forms by which the force is externalized. Gerhardsson singles out four of these forms or "dimensions": 1) verbal tradition (the words by which the content of tradition is expressed); 2) behavioral tradition (the human example by which the content of tradition is individually lived); 3) institutional tradition ("social fellowship, order, organization, structures, establishments" by which the content of tradition is communally lived); 4) material tradition ("specific localities, special clothes, tools or other outward equipment" by which the tradition is physically conveyed by non-human means) (pp. 11-14).

After some commentary and further distinctions (pp. 14-16), Gerhardsson applies his model to ancient Judaism as it existed from roughly 200 B.C. to A.D. 200 (pp. 17-19), and then to early Christianity (pp. 20-57), but reversing the order of the four forms of outer tradition so that the verbal tradition ends up at the end and with three-fourths of the space.

As the reader is gradually caught up in Gerhardsson's attempts to be as concrete as possible in his description of primitive Christian tradition the initial scepticism in the face of the rather arbitrary-seeming presentation of the model is attenuated. The method is seen as a means of forcing oneself to clarify one's presuppositions concerning the topic. Continued refinement will doubtless result in fresh insights. But sooner or later Gerhardsson should clarify the sources of his model, for even though the initial scepticism of the model is attenuated, it does not entirely disappear.

There is much to recommend in Gerhardsson's approach and he largely succeeds in doing what he intended to—enable research to make concrete reconstructions of the past. But a nagging doubt suggests itself. The basic difficulty revolves around whether the traditions of Christianity can be adequately analyzed by a model drawn from the common denominators of other traditions. Christianity seems too *sui generis* to make this feasible, even though Christianity is not so unique as to make all analysis based on comparisons impossible. Specifically, the role of the Eucharist and the role of the Spirit seem to preclude categorization in Gerhardsson's model. Is the Eucharist verbal, behavioral, institutional, or material? Is the Spirit verbal, behavioral, institutional, or material? And yet each of these realities—Eucharist and Spirit—was at the center of Christian tradition, each in its own way, and was perceived as such by the early Christians. There was a Christian time when there was no distinctively Christian scripture, but there never was a Christian time when there was no Spirit or no Eucharist. It was around the Eucharist and the Spirit that the other dimensions of Gerhardsson's traditions would seem to have grouped themselves. It might be worth

pondering how far the Gospels can be explained if they are viewed as attempts to clarify, among other things, the presence of the Eucharist and the Spirit in the midst of the Christian community.

But these negative remarks should not be seen out of focus—the value of Gerhardsson's book is attested by the reservations as well as by the agreement which it calls forth.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

James SWETNAM, S.J.

Varia

Les Constitutions apostoliques. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Marcel Metzger. Tome I, livres I et II; tome II, livres III-VI (Sources chrétiennes, 320 et 329). 356 et 409 p. 19,5 × 12,5. Paris 1985 et 1986. Le Cerf. FF 260 et 299.

Compilées à Antioche en 380, les Constitutions apostoliques sont un témoin précieux des institutions ecclésiales à la fin du IV^e siècle. Elles ont trouvé en M. Metzger un éditeur à la hauteur de leur difficulté. L'introduction se répartit entre les deux tomes. Le tome I^{er} en donne les chapitres I (genre littéraire et origines, p. 13-62) et II (tradition manuscrite, p. 63-94: p. 65, description des manuscrits; p. 66-74, leur description; p. 77-88, classement par familles). Le tome II contient les ch. III (théologie, p. 10-39) et IV (institutions des églises, p. 40-110). «La bibliographie et les tables paraîtront dans le troisième volume, avec les livres VII et VIII des C.A.» (t. II, p. 9); espérons-les prochaines; dès maintenant chacun des deux premiers tomes se termine par un index scripturaire.

Le caractère de compilation des C.A. «correspond au groupement de trois documents»: *Didascalie* (C.A. I-VI), *Didachè* (C.A. VII 1-32), *Diataxeis* (C.A. VIII 3-45). La comparaison avec la *Didascalie*, dont le texte a été repris presque intégralement dans les C.A. comme celui de la *Didachè*, serait plus sûre si le grec n'avait disparu. Plusieurs tableaux (p. 24-28) résument les sources du compilateur: I^{re} épître de Clément aux Romains, Pseudo-Clémentines, Actes apocryphes. «Déjà importantes dans les sources des C.A., les citations bibliques le sont encore davantage dans les interpolations» ... et «c'est... là qu'apparaissent le plus clairement le style et les procédés du compilateur» (t. I, p. 30). Celui-ci, qui est aussi l'interpolateur des Lettres d'Ignace d'Antioche et l'auteur du commentaire arien sur Job» (p. 32), manie bien le style pseudépigraphique (p. 33-38).

«A l'apogée de l'ancienne littérature canonique» (p. 39), l'auteur couvre

de l'autorité apostolique un ensemble de traditions et d'institutions qui comblait «le vide législatif des premiers siècles du christianisme» (p. 48).

«La théologie des *C.A.*» (introduction, ch. III) ramène la question du vocabulaire; il est plus biblique que philosophique, et assez ambigu pour qu'on ne puisse en conclure que le compilateur adhère à tel ou tel parti (t. II, p. 14). L'absence de formules incontestablement ariennes n'a pas préservé l'œuvre du reproche d'arianisme (p. 16-18); elle y prêtait surtout en faisant dépendre le Saint-Esprit du Père et du Fils (p. 35-36); mais sur la génération du Fils ou l'histoire du salut la doctrine reste orthodoxe.

Parmi les textes que les *C.A.* nous ont transmis en grec, citons en II 22, 12-14 la prière apocryphe de Manassé, qui «a été intégrée dans le psautier liturgique des Eglises d'Orient» (I, p. 217, note). En I 8, 3, l'éloge d'une maîtresse femme (Prov 31,10-31) ne révèle pas de variantes notables par rapport à la LXX. Au § 4 (v. 14), pour l'αὐτῇ des LXX, *C.A.* lisent αὐτῇ sans variante; ce pronom, que la traduction omet, ne peut se rapporter qu'à τῇ ἀνδρὶ (§ 3 = v. 12): «lui (rapportant des vivres)». Au § 5 (v. 16), le κατεφύτευσεν des LXX devient dans *C.A.* ἐφύτευσεν, sans variante de part et d'autre.

Des vétilles de ce genre ne sauraient diminuer la valeur d'une édition en tous points remarquable.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

Edouard DES PLACES

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Stanislas Lyonnet, S.J. (1902-1986) In Memoriam

Né à Saint-Etienne le 23 août 1902, Stanislas Lyonnet entra le 16 octobre 1919 au noviciat des jésuites à Sainte-Foy-lez-Lyon. Il obtint la licence-ès-lettres en 1924 à l'Université de Grenoble. Pendant trois ans, il enseigna le grec et la philologie classique au juvénat des jésuites à Yzeure. Il étudia la linguistique indo-européenne à Paris, à l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, où il suivit les cours du célèbre professeur A. Meillet. Le mémoire qu'il rédigea pour obtenir le diplôme de l'École, «Le parfait en arménien classique», fut publié en 1934 dans la collection de la Société de Linguistique de Paris. Le P. Lyonnet fut alors invité par le P. Lagrange à rédiger pour le *Manuel de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament* les chapitres concernant les versions arméniennes et géorgiennes. Il s'ensuivit une longue correspondance très cordiale entre le jeune linguiste et l'exégète chevronné.

Après ses études de philosophie et de théologie, le P. Lyonnet fut présenté pour la chaire d'arménien à l'École des Langues Orientales vivantes de Paris, et il était tout disposé à s'engager dans cette voie, mais ses supérieurs préférèrent l'orienter vers les études bibliques. Il arriva donc à l'Institut Biblique en 1936 et y prépara la licence. En 1938, il retourna à Lyon-Fourvière pour y enseigner l'Écriture Sainte à la place du P. Huby, tombé malade. En 1942, le P. Lyonnet était nommé professeur d'arménien et de géorgien à la Faculté Orientale de l'Institut Biblique. A partir de 1943-44, il donna aussi des cours d'exégèse paulinienne et les *Acta P.I.B.* lui reconnaissent alors une double appartenance, Faculté Orientale et Faculté Biblique, situation qui dura jusqu'en 1951. En 1950, le P. Lyonnet publiait sa thèse de doctorat sur *Les origines de la version arménienne des Évangiles et le Diatessaron*. L'année suivante, il laissa au P. Smith l'enseignement de l'arménien et du géorgien et se consacra entièrement à l'exégèse et à la théologie du N.T. Nommé en 1945 doyen de la Faculté Biblique, il remplit cette charge jusqu'en 1967, année où il fut nommé pour deux ans Vice-Recteur de l'Institut.

Sa longue carrière de professeur a été extrêmement féconde. Il était universellement connu comme un maître en exégèse paulinienne et en théologie biblique. C'est à lui que fut confié le soin de traduire et d'annoter les lettres aux Romains et aux Galates dans la Bible de Jérusalem. Le *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* lui doit l'article «Péché. Judaïsme, Nouveau Testament. Péché originel». Il publia un grand nombre d'études exégétiques, certaines très techniques, comme son article sur le *eph'hô* de Rm 12, d'autres

plus accessibles. Dans ses cours, il analysait les textes avec beaucoup de précision et discutait habilement les questions difficiles, mais il communiquait en même temps à ses étudiants son enthousiasme pour les aspects les plus lumineux de la foi et de la vie chrétienne, mettant toujours au premier plan la révélation de l'amour de Dieu dans le mystère du Christ. Il encourageait la recherche en bien des secteurs divers et dirigea un nombre impressionnant de thèses de doctorat. Dans sa façon de pratiquer l'exégèse, il était attentif aux problèmes de notre temps et aux grands courants de la vie de l'Église, en particulier à la recherche de l'unité chrétienne. Il avait de multiples relations œcuméniques, en particulier avec le Prof. O. Cullman et avec Frère Roger, fondateur de la communauté de Taizé.

Son ouverture d'esprit lui attira d'innombrables sympathies, mais elle suscita aussi des oppositions. Juste avant le Concile, une campagne fut menée contre lui en haut lieu. En 1962, le P. Lyonnet dut suspendre son enseignement exégétique; il restait cependant doyen de la Faculté Biblique. Rétabli dans ses droits en 1964, après l'élection du Pape Paul VI, il fut par la suite nommé consultant de la Congrégation pour la Doctrine de la Foi.

A son travail de recherche intellectuelle, le P. Lyonnet a toujours ajouté de nombreuses activités pastorales: direction spirituelle, conférences, sessions et retraites en France, en Italie, au Canada et en Afrique. En 1982, il fut invité à prêcher la retraite de carême au Vatican, en présence du Pape. Il parla avec son ardeur habituelle. A la fin, le Pape le félicita chaleureusement de sa vivacité et de sa jeunesse de cœur. Il avait alors 79 ans. Il continua ensuite à accepter des ministères jusqu'à épuisement de ses forces.

En décembre 1985, son état de santé rendit nécessaire son hospitalisation à l'infirmerie de l'Université Grégorienne. Malgré les soins les plus attentifs, il s'affaiblit progressivement. Il s'éteignit doucement dans l'après-midi du 8 juin 1986, laissant à tous ceux qui l'ont connu le souvenir d'un professeur éminent et d'un apôtre fraternel, rempli de l'amour qui vient de Dieu.

Institut Biblique
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Roma

Albert VANHOYE S.J.

Congrès de l'ACFEB

L'ACFEB (Association Catholique Française pour l'étude de la Bible) tiendra son prochain congrès à Lyon du 31 août au 4 septembre 1987.

Il portera sur les Paraboles évangéliques. Des conférences et des études de textes permettront de faire le point des recherches récentes et d'évaluer sur des exemples précis l'apport de la poétique, de la sémiotique, de l'histoire de la rédaction, de l'herméneutique. Elles voudraient contribuer au renouvellement remarquable des études exégétiques sur ce thème et en favoriser le retentissement pastoral.

Pour tous renseignements, s'adresser à :

Secrétariat Général du XII^e Congrès ACFEB
Institut Catholique
25, rue du Plat, 69288 LYON Cédex 2 France

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum
Annus academicus 1986-1987. I semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 300, qui in diversa categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	13	260	23	296
Fac. Orientalistica	—	—	4	4
Universi	13	260	27	300
Nationes	60	Alumni		300
Dioceses	169	Alumni		178
Inst. Religiosorum	38	Alumni		97
Inst. Religiosarum	8	Alumnae		8
Ex statu laicali	17	Alumnae		9
		Alumni		8

Laureae

Laurea in Re Biblica dignus declaratus est:

MAEIJER, D. Floor J.M. (20.I.1987). *The Account of the Prophetic Actions against the Baal Policy of the House of Ahab (1 Kings 16,20–2 Kings 11,20)* (Cum laude). Moderator: L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

BOVATI, Pietro, S.J., *Ristabilire la giustizia* (Analecta Biblica 110). Roma 1986.

FREZZA, Fortunato, *Il libro di Michea: ascendenze filologico-letterarie semiticonordoccidentali* (extractum). Roma 1985.

SPREAFICO, Ambrogio, *Esodo: memoria e promessa. Interpretazioni profetiche* (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 14). Roma 1985.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

La liste ci-dessous comprend tous les livres adressés à *Biblica* qui sont en rapport avec les études bibliques, y compris ceux qui ne pourront faire l'objet d'un compte rendu. En signalant un ouvrage, la Revue ne se prononce pas à son sujet.

Les livres envoyés à la Revue ne seront pas retournés à l'expéditeur, même si aucun compte rendu n'en est publié (à moins qu'ils n'aient été envoyés sur demande de la Direction).

Les livres et les articles ou extraits de revues qui nous sont adressés seront communiqués au directeur de l'*Elenchus bibliographicus biblicus*.

Prière d'adresser les envois à la «Direction de *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, 00187 Rome, Italie».

Vetus Testamentum

Avigad, Nahman, *Hebrew Bullae From the Time of Jeremiah*. Remnants of a Burnt Archive. 139 p. 24,5 × 18. Jerusalem 1986. Israel Exploration Society.

Bal, Mieke, *Femmes imaginaires*. L'ancien testament au risque d'une narratologie critique (Ecrire les Femmes). 281 p. 22,8 × 14. Utrecht - Paris 1986. H & S Publishers - A.G. Nizet. Fl. 39,50.

La Bible d'Alexandrie. La Genèse. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante, Introduction et Notes par Marguerite **Harl**. 336 p., 20 × 14. Paris 1986. Les Editions du Cerf.

Bovati, Pietro, *Ristabilire la Giustizia*. Procedure, vocabolario, orientamenti (Analecta Biblica 110). 446 p. 24 × 16,5. Roma 1986. Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Carena, Omar, *Il resto di Israele*. Studio storico-comparativo delle iscrizioni reali assire e dei testi profetici sul tema del resto (Associazione Biblica Italiana; Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 13). 108 p. 24 × 16,5. Bologna 1985. Edizioni Dehoniane Bologna. Lit. 12.000.

Daube, David, *Witnesses in Bible and Talmud*. **Carmichael**, Calum, *Biblical Laws of Talion* 39 p. 21 × 14,8. Oxford 1986. Oxford Centre for Hebrew Studies.

Garbini, Giovanni, *Storia e ideologia nell'Israele antico* (Biblioteca di storia e storiografia dei tempi biblici 3). 254 p. 23 × 15. Brescia 1986. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 30.000.

Gibert, Pierre, *Bible, mythes et récits de commencement* (Parole de Dieu). 154 p. 20,5 × 14. Paris 1986. Editions du Seuil. FF 95.

Gordon, P. Robert, *1 & 2 Samuel*. A Commentary. 375 p. 23 × 14,2. Exeter 1986. The Paternoster Press. UK £12.95.

Haag, E. – Hossfeld, F.-L. (Hrsg.), *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn*. Beiträge zur Theologie der Psalmen. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Heinrich Groß (Stuttgarter Biblische Beiträge 13). xii-533 p. 23,2 × 15,2. Stuttgart 1986. Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Hartberger, Birgit, "An den Wassern von Babylon...". Psalm 137 auf dem Hintergrund von Jeremia 51, der biblischen Edom-Traditionen und babylonischer Originalquellen (Bonner Biblische Beiträge, Band 63). ix-305 p. 24,5 × 16,3.

Japhet, Sara (Ed.), *Studies in Bible* (Scripta Hierosolymitana, Volume XXXI). viii-437 p. 24,3 × 17,5. Jerusalem 1986. Magnes Press – The Hebrew University.

Jerger, Günter, "Evangelium des Alten Testaments". Die Grundbotschaft des Propheten Deuterjesaja in ihrer Bedeutung für den Religionsunterricht (Stuttgarter Biblische Beiträge 14). vii-469 p. 23,2 × 15,2. Stuttgart 1986. Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Jobling, David, *The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Structural Analyses in the Hebrew Bible*, II (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 39). 152 p. 21,3 × 13,5. Sheffield 1986. JSOT Press. US \$18.50.

Lee, Thomas R., *Studies in the Form of Sirach 44–50* (Society of Biblical Literature, Dissertation Series 75). xii-271 p. 21,5 × 14. Atlanta, Georgia 1986. Scholars Press. \$12.95.

Loader, J.A., *Ecclesiastes*. A Practical Commentary (Text and Interpretation). vii-136 p. 21 × 13,2. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1986. Eerdmans Publishing Company. UK £6.20.

Lust, J. (Ed.) (*et alii*), *Ezekiel and His Book*. Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interrelation (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, LXXIV). 391 p. 24,2 × 16. Leuven 1986. University Press. FB 2700.

Marcus, David, *Jephthah and His Vow*. 77 p. 25,5 × 17,8. Lubbock, Texas 1986. Texas Tech Press. \$15.00.

Mazar, Benjamin, *The Early Biblical Period*. Historical Studies. ix-266 p. Jerusalem 1986. Israel Exploration Society.

McComiskey, Thomas Edward, *The Covenants of Promise*. A Theology of the Old Testament Covenants. 259 p. 22,7 × 15. Nottingham 1987. Intervarsity Press. U.K. £7.50.

Na'aman, Nadav, *Borders and Districts in Biblical Historiography*. Seven Studies in Biblical Geographical Lists (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 4). 275 p. 21,2 × 13,5. Jerusalem 1986. Simor Ltd.

Oswalt, John N., *The Book of Isaiah*. Chapters 1-39 (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament). xi-746 p. 22,3 × 15. Grand Rapids, MI 1986. William B. Eerdmans. UK £26.60.

Rendsburg, Gary A., *The Redaction of Genesis*. xii-129 p. 23,5 × 15,8. Winona Lake, Indiana 1986. Eisenbrauns.

Talmon, Shemaryahu, *King, Cult and Calendar in Ancient Israel* (Collected Studies). 244 p. 24,4 × 17,5. Jerusalem 1986. The Magnes Press. US \$22.00.

Weren, W. - **Poulsen**, N. (Eds.), *Bij de put van Jakob*. Exegetische opstellen (TFT- Studies 5). ix-154 p. 24 × 17. Tilburg 1986. Tilburg University Press.

Novum Testamentum

Benítez, Manuel, «*Esta salvación de Dios*» (Hech 28,28). Analisis narrativo estructuralista de «Hechos» (Publicaciones de la Universidad Pontificia Comillas de Madrid, Serie I. Estudios, 35). xxiii-784 p. 24 × 17. Madrid 1986. UPCM.

Best, Ernest, *Disciples and Discipleship*. Studies in the Gospel According to Mark. xi-244 p. 22,2 × 14,4. Edinburgh 1986. UK £11.95.

Brutscheck, Jutta, *Die Maria-Marta-Erzählung*. Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zu Lk 10,38-42 (Bonner Biblische Beiträge Band 64). 291 p. 24,5 × 16,3. Frankfurt 1986. Verlag Peter Hanstein GmbH. DM 78.—.

Caba, José, *Resucitó Cristo, mi esperanza*. Estudio exegético (Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 475). xxxii-407 p. 20 × 12,5. Madrid 1986. Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos.

Georgi, Dieter, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians*. xv-462 p. 22 × 14,5. Philadelphia 1986. Fortress Press.

Grelot, Pierre, *L'origine des évangiles*. Controverse avec J. Carmignac (Apologique). 154 p. 23,5 × 14,5. Paris 1986. Les Editions du Cerf. FF 82.

Heine, Susanne, *Frauen der frühen Christenheit*. Zur historischen Kritik einer feministischen Theologie. 194 p. 21 × 13. Göttingen 1986. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Junack, K. - **Grunewald**, W., *Die Katholischen Briefe*. Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus (Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung 6). ix-171 p. 23,4 × 15,9. Berlin-New York 1986. Walter de Gruyter.

Kiley, Mark, *Colossians as Pseudepigraphy* (The Biblical Seminar 4). 148 p. 21,5 × 13,9. Sheffield 1986. JSOT Press. US \$11.95.

Küchler, Max, *Schweigen, Schumuck und Schleier*. Drei neutestamentliche Vorschriften zur Verdrängung der Frauen auf dem Hintergrund einer frauenfeindlichen Exegese des Alten Testaments im antiken Judentum (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 1). xxi-538 p. 23,5 × 15,7. Freiburg, Schweiz – Göttingen 1986. Universitätsverlag – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

La Potterie (de) I., *La Passion de Jésus selon l'Evangile de Jean*. Texte et Esprit (Lire la Bible 73). 221 p. 18 × 11,6. Paris 1986. Les Editions du Cerf. FF 89.

Lang, Friedrich, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (Das Neue Testament Deutsch 7). 382 p. 24,1 × 16. Göttingen und Zürich 1986. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. DM 48,—.

Lieu, Judith, *The Second and Third Epistles of John: History and Background* (Studies of the New Testament and Its World). x-264 p. 22 × 14,5. Edinburgh 1986. T. & T. Clark. UK £12.95.

Marcus, Joel, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* (SBL Dissertation Series 90). xiv-272 p. 21,7 × 14. Atlanta, Georgia 1986. Scholars Press. \$12.95.

Matera, Frank J., *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies*. Interpreting the Synoptics Through Their Passion Stories (Theological Inquiries). xi-256 p. 20,3 × 13,7. New York – Mahwah 1986. Paulist Press.

Meade, David G., *Pseudonymity and Canon*. An Investigation into the Relationship of Authorship and Authority in Jewish and Earliest Christian Tradition (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 39). 257 p. Tübingen 1986. J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). DM 98.—.

Mosetto, Francesco, *I miracoli evangelici nel dibattito tra Celso e Origene* (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 76). 172 p. 24 × 16,5. Roma 1986. Libreria Ateneo Salesiano. Lit. 20.000.

Muñoz Iglesias, Salvador, *Los Evangelios de la Infancia II*. Los anuncios angélicos previos en el Evangelio lucano de la infancia (Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 479). xii-321 p. 20 × 12,5. Madrid 1986. Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos.

Perrier, Pierre, *Karozoutha*. Annonce orale de la bonne nouvelle en araméen et évangiles greco-latins. 704 p. 15 × 24. Paris 1986. Editions Medias-paul. FF 220.

Pirot, Jean, *Trois amies de Jésus de Nazareth* (Lire la Bible 74). 145 p. 18 × 11,5. Paris 1986. Les Editions du Cerf. FF 66.

Räsänen, Heikki, *The Torah and Christ*. Essays in German and English on the Problem of the Law in Early Christianity (Publications of the Finnish

Exegetical Society 45). vii-377 p. 21 × 14,8. Helsinki 1986. The Finnish Exegetical Society.

Reicke, Bo, *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels*. x-189 p. 23,5 × 16. Philadelphia 1986. Fortress Press.

Sanders, Ed Parish, *Paolo e il giudaismo palestinese*. Studio comparativo su modelli di religione (Biblioteca teologica 21). 845 p. 22,5 × 15,7. Brescia 1986. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 80.000.

Schlier, H. (et alii), *La storia della cristologia primitiva*. Gli inizi biblici e la formula di Nicea (Studi Biblici 75). 141 p. 20,7 × 13,6. Brescia 1986. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 15.000.

Schneider, Gerhard, *Gli Atti degli Apostoli II*. Testo greco e traduzione. Commento ai capp. 9,1-28,31 (Commentario teologico del Nuovo Testamento V/2). 583 p. 22,6 × 15,5. Brescia 1986. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 65.000.

Schramm, T. - Löwenstein, K., *Unmoralische Helden*. Anstößige Gleichnisse Jesu. 204 p. 21 × 13. Göttingen 1986. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Sheehan, Thomas, *The First Coming*. How the Kingdom of God Became Christianity. 287 p. 24 × 16. New York, NY 1986. Random House. \$18.95.

Stramare, Tarcisio, *Matteo divorzista?* Studio su Mt. 5,32 e 19,9 (Studi Biblici 76). 96 p. 20,7 × 13,6. Brescia 1986. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 10.000.

Thiede, Carsten Peter, *Simon Peter. From Galilee to Rome*. 272 p. 21,6 × 14. Exeter 1986. The Paternoster Press. UK £7.95.

Thiede, C.P., *Die älteste Evangelien-Handschrift?* Das Markus-Fragment von Qumran und die Anfänge der schriftlichen Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments (Theologische Verlagsgemeinschaft). 80 p. 19 × 12. Wuppertal 1986. Brockhaus.

Vanhoye, A. (et alii), *L'apôtre Paul*. Personnalité, style et conception du ministère (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologianum Lovaniensium, LXXIII). xiii-474 p. 24,2 × 16. Leuven 1986. Peeters - University Press. FB 2.600.

Watson, Francis, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles*. A Sociological Approach (Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series 56). xii-246 p. 22,3 × 14. Cambridge 1986. Cambridge University Press. UK £22.50.

Wenham, D. - Blomberg, C. (Eds.), *The Miracles of Jesus* (Gospel Perspectives 6). 457 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1986. JSOT Press. US \$13.50.

White, John L., *Light from Ancient Letters* (Foundations & Facets: New Testament). xviii-238 p. 24,1 × 21,5. Philadelphia 1986. Fortress Press.

Varia

Amata, Biagio, *Cultura e lingue classiche*. Convegno di aggiornamento e di didattica Roma, 1-2 novembre 1985 (Studi-Testi-Commenti Patristici). 156 p. 24 × 16,5. Roma 1986. Libreria Ateneo Salesiano. Lit. 20.000.

Begastri: *imagen y problemas de su historia* (Antigüedad y cristianismo). 153 p. 23,7 × 16,8. Murcia 1984. Universidad de Murcia.

Brown, Neil, *Christians in a Pluralist Society* (Faith and Culture 12). VIII-145 p. 20,5 × 13,3. Sydney 1986. Catholic Institute of Sydney.

Caquot, A.-Hadas-Lebel, M.-Riaud, J. (Eds.), *Hellenica et Judaica*. Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky. 519 p. 24 × 16. Leuven-Paris 1986. Editions Peeters.

Carson, D. A. - Woodbridge, J.D. (Eds.), *Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon*. XII-468 p. 21 × 13,5. Nottingham 1986. Inter-Varsity Press. UK £9.95.

Les Constitutions Apostoliques, Tome II, Livres II-IV (Sources Chrétien-nes 329). Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Marcel Metzger. 409 p. 19,5 × 12,5. Paris 1986. Les Editions du Cerf. FF 299.

Del conventus carthaginensis a la chora de Tudmir. Perspectivas de la historia de Murcia entre los siglos III-VIII (Antigüedad y cristianismo II). 387 p. 23,7 × 16,8. Murcia 1985. Universidad de Murcia.

Diez Macho, Alejandro, *Salvación en la Palabra. Targum-Derash-Berith*. En memoria del profesor Alejandro Diez Macho. Edición preparada por el profesor Domingo Muñoz Leon. 848 p. 24 × 15,5. Madrid 1986. Ediciones Cristiandad.

Egger, Rita, *Josephus Flavius und die Samaritaner*. Eine terminologische Untersuchung zur Identitätsklärung der Samaritaner (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 4). 412 p. 23,5 × 15,7. Freiburg Schweiz - Göttingen 1987. Universitätsverlag - Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Felici, Sergio, *Spiritualità del lavoro nella catechesi dei Padri del III-IV secolo* (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 75). 279 p. 24 × 16,5. Roma 1986. Libreria Ateneo Salesiano. Lit. 35.000.

Harder, Günter, *Kirche und Israel*. Arbeiten zum christlich-jüdischen Verhältnis. (Studien zu jüdischem Volk und christlicher Gemeinde. Band 7). 281 p. 21 × 14,8. Berlin 1986. Institut Kirche und Judentum. DM 17,80.

Kamin, Sarah, *Rashi's Exegetical Categorization in Respect to the Distinction Between Peshat and Derash*. 297 p. 22,8 × 16. Jerusalem 1986. The Magnes Press.

Kraft, R.A. - Nickelsburg, G.W.E. (Eds.), *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (SBL The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters). XVIII-494 p. 23,5

× 15,8. Philadelphia – Atlanta, Georgia 1986. Fortress Press – Scholars Press.

Lindeskog, Gösta, *Das jüdisch-christliche Problem*. Randglossen zu einer Forschungsepoche. 241 p. 24,4 × 16,2. Uppsala 1986. Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Minette de Tillesse, G., *Nova Jerusalem*. Ecclesiologia. 171 p. 22 × 15. Fortaleza 1986. Editora Nova Jerusalem.

Neusner, J.-Sarason, R.S. (Eds.), *The Tosefta*. Translated from the Hebrew. First Division Zera'im (The Order of Agriculture). xxii-373 p. 23,5 × 15,7. Hoboken, NJ 1986. KTAV Publishing House. \$59.50.

Nitzan, Bilha, *Pesher Habakkuk*. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea (1QpHab). 222 p. 24,5 × 17,5. Jerusalem 1986. The Bialik Institute.

Palmer, Bernard (Ed.), *Medicine and the Bible*. 272 p. 21,6 × 14. Exeter 1986. The Paternoster Press. UK £7.95.

Patak Siman, Emmanuel, *Narsai. Cinq homélies sur les paraboles évangéliques*. 209 p. 21,5 × 13,1. Paris 1984. Cariscript.

Pavanetto, Cletus, *Litterarum Graecarum Classicarum lineamenta potiora*. Pars prior. 156 p. Pars altera. 170 p. 24 × 17. Roma 1986. Libreria Ateneo Salesiano. Lit. 20.000 ciascuno.

Rahner, Karl, *Expériences d'un théologien catholique*. Traduit et présenté par Raymond Mengus. 50 p. 19,5 × 15,3. Paris 1986. Cariscript.

Rast, Walter E. (Ed.), *Preliminary Reports of Asor-Sponsored Excavations, 1980-84* (BASOR Supplement 24.). 164 p. 28 × 21,6. Winona Lake, Indiana 1986. Eisenbrauns. \$20.00.

Richter, Wolfgang, *Untersuchungen zur Valenz althebräischer Verben*. 2. GBH, 'MQ, QSR II. 220 p. 21 × 14,5. St. Ottilien 1986. Eos Verlag.

Ries, Julien (Ed.) (et alii), *L'expression du sacré dans les grandes religions III. Mazdéisme, Cultes isiaques, Religion grecque, Manichéisme, Nouveau Testament, Vie de L'Homo religieux (Homo Religiosus 3)*. 441 p. 24 × 16. Louvain-la-Neuve 1986. Centre d'Histoire des religions. FB 1200.

Ries, Julien (Ed.), *Les rites d'initiation*. Actes du Colloque de Liège et de Louvain-la-Neuve, 20-21 novembre 1984 (Homo Religiosus 13). 559 p. 24 × 16. Louvain-la-Neuve 1986. Centre d'Histoire des Religions.

Sanderson, Judith E., *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran 4QpaleoExod^m and the Samaritan Tradition* (Harvard Semitic Studies 30). xix-358 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Atlanta, Georgia 1986. Scholars Press. \$13.95.

Simonis, Walter, *Das Reich Gottes ist mitten unter euch*. Neuorientierung an Jesu Lehre und Leben. 103 p. 20,5 × 13,4. Düsseldorf 1986. Patmos Verlag.

Stanley, David M., *"I encountered God!" The Spiritual Exercises with the Gospel of Saint John*. 328 p. 23,5 × 16. St. Louis, Missouri 1986. The Institute of Jesuit Sources.

Strothmann, Werner, *Kondordanz zur syrischen Bibel. Der Pentateuch*. Teil I: A-D. 619 p. Teil II: H-L. 1312 p. Teil III: M-'A. 1965 p. Teil IV: P-T. 2556 p. 24,5 × 17,3. Wiesbaden 1986. Otto Harrassowitz.

Tardieu, Michel (Ed.), *Les règles de l'interprétation*. Centre d'Etudes des Religions du Livre. 229 p. 23,5 × 14,3. Paris 1987. Les Editions du Cerf.

Van Roo, William A., *Telling About God*. Volume II. Experience (Analecta Gregoriana 244, Series Facultatis Theologiae: sectio A, n. 27). xi-344 p. 23 × 16,4. Roma 1987. Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana. Lit. 40.000.

Wehr, Lothar, *Arznei der Unsterblichkeit*. Die Eucharistie bei Ignatius von Antiochien und im Johannesevangelium. 399 p. 24,1 × 16,2. Münster 1987. Aschendorff.

Weinfeld, Moshe, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect*. A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 2). 100 p. 23,5 × 15,7. Fribourg, Suisse - Göttingen 1986. Editions Universitaires - Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wendland, Paul, *La cultura ellenistico-romana nei suoi rapporti con giudaismo e cristianesimo* (Biblioteca di storia e storiografia dei tempi biblici 2). 421 p. 23 × 15,5. Brescia 1986. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 40.000.

Zanetti, Ugo, *Les manuscrits de Dair Abû Maqâr*. Inventaire (Cahiers d'Orientalisme XI). 100 p. 30 × 21,5. Genève 1986. Patrick Cramer.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

TIPOGRAFIA POLIGLOTTA DELLA PONTIFICIA UNIVERSITÀ GREGORIANA
PIAZZA DELLA PILOTTA, 4 - ROMA